

NOIES WITH
THE BOOK
ONLY

UNIVERSAL
LIBRARY

OU_218182

UNIVERSAL
LIBRARY

EVERYMAN'S LIBRARY
EDITED BY ERNEST RHYS

HISTORY

GROTE'S HISTORY OF
GREECE IN TWELVE VOLS
VOLUME ONE
WITH AN INTRODUCTION BY
A. D. LINDSAY, M.A.

THIS IS NO. 186 OF *EVERYMAN'S
LIBRARY*. THE PUBLISHERS WILL
BE PLEASED TO SEND FREELY TO ALL
APPLICANTS A LIST OF THE PUBLISHED
AND PROJECTED VOLUMES, ARRANGED
UNDER THE FOLLOWING SECTIONS:

TRAVEL & SCIENCE & FICTION
THEOLOGY & PHILOSOPHY
HISTORY & CLASSICAL
FOR YOUNG PEOPLE
ESSAYS & ORATORY
POETRY & DRAMA
BIOGRAPHY
REFERENCE
ROMANCE



IN FOUR STYLES OF BINDING: CLOTH,
FLAT BACK, COLOURED TOP; LEATHER,
ROUND CORNERS, GILT TOP; LIBRARY
BINDING IN CLOTH, & QUARTER PIGSKIN

LONDON: J. M. DENT & SONS, LTD.
NEW YORK: E. P. DUTTON & CO.

“ONSIDER HISTORY WITH THE BEGINNINGS OF IT STRETCHING DIMLY INTO THE REMOTE TIME; EMERGING DARKLY OUT OF THE MYSTERIOUS ETERNITY: THE TRUE EPIC POEM AND UNIVERSAL DIVINE SCRIPTURE. . . .”



— CARLYLE —

A HISTORY OF GREECE BY GEORGE GROTE

VOLUME I

EVERY
MAN
I WILL
GO
WITH
THEE
BE THY
GUIDE



INTHY
MOST
NEED
TOP
GO
BY
THY
SIDE

LONDON: PUBLISHED
by J.M.DENT & CO
AND IN NEW YORK
BY E.P.DUTTON & CO

mcmlxxviii.

*First printed 1907
Reprinted 1918*

INTRODUCTION

GROTE'S "History of Greece" was first published just sixty years ago. Since then many histories of Greece have been written, but of those written in England, Grote's still remains in some respects the greatest. It was the first great history of Greece written in the spirit of scientific criticism which marked the renascence of classical studies in the nineteenth century. Grote had an unrivalled knowledge of and command over the literary sources, and so far as Greek history depends on such sources, his history is still, and will remain, up to date. He has been condemned as a partisan, and we can hardly claim him as an impartial historian. He is throughout the fervent defender of Athenian democracy. For him Athens, and especially Athenian democrats, are always in the right, and he outdoes even Herodotus in his contempt for tyrants, oligarchs and Spartans. He commits too often the fault of reading the prejudices and passions of modern politics into ancient history. But for this attitude there are excuses, and it has its compensations. His impassioned defence of Athenian democracy was a natural reaction against the foolish carpings of anti-democratic historians like Mitford. And his enthusiasm for Athens is not always to be regretted. His whole-hearted appreciation of her ideals may not always result in "scientific" history, but it gave him a sympathy and insight into Greek democracy at its best, a realization of the debt which civilization owes to Greece in politics as well as in art and speculation, which we should be sorry to be without. If he sometimes becomes a party advocate rather than an historian, his advocacy is always based on knowledge and critical insight. If Greek history still relied solely on literary sources, Grote's history would remain a great and adequate account.

But since the publication of his history a great change has come over our knowledge of Greek civilization. We no longer rely solely on literary sources, on Herodotus, Thucydides and Xenophon,

and other historians. We have also the important evidence of archæology. All over Greece archæologists have brought to light countless memorials of Greek civilization. In Grote's time the sources for Greek history were scanty, and we had no means of checking the statements of one historian, except comparison with those of another. Contradictions between Herodotus and Thucydides, or between Thucydides and later writers, could be resolved only by conjecture, by a discussion of the inherent probabilities of each case. But since then inscriptions have been discovered in great number which throw new light on such subjects as, for example, the working of the Athenian constitution, and by which we can often check, corroborate or correct the statements of historians. Further, our literary sources have been increased by the important discovery in Egypt of a copy of Aristotle's lost *'Αθηναίων πολιτεία*. The result is that since Grote's time Greek history has been to a large extent amplified, and in some respects reconstructed.

In the light of such fresh discoveries can we say that any history of Greece published sixty years ago is still of value? The answer to this question depends upon our conception of the respective contributions to history of archæology and the contemporary records. We learn far more of the history of any period from its literature, and particularly from its historical literature than from its monuments. The consequence is that where our knowledge of any period of history depends upon contemporary written sources, archæology cannot usually do much to change our conception of the period. It may and does make it much more vivid and fresh, but its part, supposing that our written sources are *at all* trustworthy, is much more to corroborate than to correct. Now from the end of the sixth century B.C., we have fairly ample literary sources for Greek history. And archæology, with all its fresh discoveries, has on the whole only corroborated Herodotus and Thucydides and Xenophon in so far as they dealt with the history of their own time. It has to some extent amplified our knowledge, filled up certain lacunæ, and corrected certain details. But the general conception of the history of the period remains the same. Thanks to recent discoveries, we know, for example, that the conspiracy of Kylon preceded the legislation of Dracon instead of following it, as was previously thought. We know that the Athenians in 425 very greatly increased the tribute paid by the allies. Grote had argued that the silence of Thucydides disproved this. We have found the actual inscription recording the assessment and know that he was wrong, and this new fact is of considerable importance for our estimate of the policy of Cleon and his successors. Thanks to the

discovery of many of the tribute lists and of inscriptions recording treaties between Athens and her allies, we know far more of the organization of the Athenian empire and of its history in the years between 476 and 432. But archæological evidence for this period is of great importance only because our literary records of it are so scanty. The most recent discoveries affect a later period. Only last year Messrs. Grenfell and Hunt discovered at Oxyryncus a portion of the fourth century historian Cratippus. It will enable us to correct certain details in Xenophon's account of the history of the years 396-395. It also fills up a conspicuous gap in our knowledge by its description of the Federal Constitution of Boeotia. A fragment of papyrus found recently at Strasburg and known as *Anonymous Argentensis* enables us to conclude that Grote was wrong in thinking that the Nomophylakes were an institution of Athens under Pericles. These are specimens of our new knowledge.

But all this new information, interesting as it is, is concerned with points of detail. Our knowledge of Greece from the beginning of the fifth century still rests mainly on literary sources and must always do so. And because Grote, with all his faults, was a great imaginative historian, his history of this later period has a permanent and real value which archæological discoveries cannot materially effect.

It is otherwise with the history of Greece before the end of the sixth century. For here our literary records are scantier and more untrustworthy. Thanks to Herodotus and certain passages in Thucydides we know a good deal about the history of Athens in the sixth century; we can form some notion of the early constitution of Sparta and of the stages by which it rose to the hegemony of the Peloponnese. The poems of Solon, the fragments of such early poets as Archilochus, Tyrtæus, and Theognis give us contemporary literary sources of a kind. We know something of the relations of the cities of Asia Minor to the kingdom of Lydia, more of the age of the tyrants. But as we go further back our sources become still more imperfect. We have to rely on vague legends and untrustworthy genealogies. Grote began his account of historical Greece with the Dorians already settled in the Peloponnese. He accepted 776, the first Olympiad, as the earliest historical date. But for at least a hundred and fifty years after that he had almost no historical information. Before 776 he had only legends of Dorian and Æolian migrations, genealogies going back to the gods, curious tales of early non-Hellenic races in Greece, Pelasgians, Leleges and Karians, and stories of heroes and gods. Somewhere in this dim region came the great

Introduction

Homeric poems, with their elaborate accounts of a civilization that was strangely different from that of historical Greece. Accurate historical data there were none.

Under these circumstances Grote resolved with much reason to make an absolute distinction between history and legend. It was of no use, he declared, to try to extract historical information from legend, for we have no criterion as to what in it is historical and what is not. He therefore condemned all discussions, *e. g.* about the exact site of Troy and all conjectures about the historical truth underlying the stories of Minos or Agamemnon. Legend, he insisted, is the creation of the poetic mind, and as such it must be treated. The Homeric poems might be used as evidences for the early civilization in which the writer or writers of these poems lived, but for nothing more. The importance of the legends was poetical and religious, not historical. Grote therefore began his history with a systematic account of the Greek legends and myths, which was for him an account of Greek religion. We could know, he argued, what the Greeks of the fifth century thought about the beginnings of their history, but we could also know, thanks to our superior critical insight, that what they thought was historically untrue.

At the time at which Grote wrote, this attitude was not only defensible but praiseworthy. It was a great service to insist that rationalized legend and history are very different things. But even taken on his own lines the first part has its disadvantages. It is a most misleading account of Greek religion. It represents that as far more systematic, uniform and intellectual than it actually was, and to begin a history of Greece with a systematic account of Greek religion in which the Homeric stories of the gods and the Orphic myths are treated as parts of one uniform system is misleading and anachronistic.

No one could now begin a history of Greece in the same way. Our whole conception of the beginnings of Greek civilization has been entirely changed since Grote's time, and this change is due to archæological discoveries. Of the period between the Dorian migration and the sixth century, indeed, archæology has even less to tell us than our literary records. The tradition of the Dorian migration is confirmed by archæological evidences. These seem to show that about 900 B.C. the civilization represented by Mycene was overthrown by a race who used iron and whose rude pottery was incised with geometrical designs. The older civilization lingered on in such places as Rhodes and Cyprus, and remains of that period have been discovered by archæologists. There are a few inscriptions of the

seventh and sixth centuries, but only a very few. The two or three centuries succeeding the Dorian invasion remain, and probably will always remain, the least known period in Greek history.

It is otherwise with the earlier period, that on which the Homeric poems and the early legends have always shed a glorious if baffling light. This has become peculiarly the domain of archæological discovery. Where the cautious and well-warranted scepticism of Grote proved fruitless, Schliemann's almost foolish credulity and lack of historical sense produced astonishing results. In 1870 Schliemann began to excavate the mound of Hissarlik in the Troad, in the hope of finding the ruins of the city of Troy. Grote, in his fifteenth chapter, reviews the discussion as to whether Hissarlik or Bounarbashi was the real site of Troy, and dismisses any attempt to locate the city of which Homer sang as necessarily futile. Schliemann began to dig at Hissarlik and made most startling discoveries. The mound was found to have been the site of a very early settlement, going back to Neolithic times, where one city had been built upon another. One of these was a city with strong ramparts which showed traces of having been burned. Greatest discovery of all, a coffer was found containing a store of worked gold, a collection of ornaments which were like nothing previously known to us as Greek, but which did answer to certain descriptions in Homer. Encouraged by this success, Schliemann in 1878 began to excavate the traditional site of Mycenæ. Here his discoveries were almost more astonishing. He found five tombs, hewn in the rock, filled with a profusion of gold, ivory, silver, bronzes and alabaster. The gold was beaten into face-masks, bracelets, breast-pieces and all manner of ornaments. On the site were excavated the remains of a palace, which corresponded in many ways to the description of the Homeric house. Schliemann in his enthusiasm went too far, and held that we might now consider the poems of Homer as authenticated history. Had he not found the actual death-masks of Agamemnon and Clytemnestra? But this was entirely to mistake the relations of archæology, legend and history. These discoveries no more prove that the details of the Homeric story are true, than the discovery of the Round Table would prove the historical reality of the vision of Sir Galahad. They prove the general truth of the picture of Greece given in Homer, where Mycene is the capital of a great kingdom.

But the question of the relation of these discoveries to the Homeric poems was soon lost in the questions raised concerning the discoveries themselves. For all over the Ægean similar finds were made. On the Acropolis rock at Athens, at Tiryns,

at Vaphio near Sparta, at Orchomenos, at Thebes and Delphi, and in many of the islands, Naxos, Paros, Thera, and especially in Melos, remains of a similar civilization have been discovered. These remains were at first given the general title of Mycenæan. Some of the distinctive pottery of this period was found as far afield as Egypt, and pictures of foreigners bringing Mycenæan vases as tribute "from the islands of the very green," were found upon a tomb of the eighteenth dynasty, dating from about 1200 B.C. But in the last few years fresh and even more surprising discoveries have been made. Mr. Arthur Evans has excavated Knossos, the traditional site of the palace of Minos, and we now know that the civilization of which Mycene was the chief town, was itself the successor of an earlier civilization now known as Minoan, whose centre was Crete. The artistic remains of Mycenæan civilization were wonderful, but they are nothing to the splendour of the discoveries at Knossos. Knossos was the site of a vast and elaborate palace, whose buildings rose to two or three storeys. It was ornamented with frescoes and statues of great naturalistic beauty. Its inhabitants had brought the ceramic arts to great perfection. Besides producing vases painted with great skill and beauty, they could make delicate articles of faience. Further, this civilization was acquainted with the art of writing, and we possess many inscriptions in a hitherto unknown script used by the inhabitants of Knossos somewhere in the third millennium B.C. Remains of this same earlier civilization have been found at other places in Crete, notably at Phaistos, and also at Phylakopi in the island of Melos. The legends of Minos, equally with the story of Troy, are shown to have had a real foundation. Mr. Evans has discovered what was certainly the origin of the story of the labyrinth. Frescoes of bull-fights, even of a minotaur, were discovered upon the walls of the palace. Discoveries in Sicily have shown that there was a connection between the Minoan kingdom and that island, of which the story told by Herodotus, how Minos met his death there, seems to be an echo. In any case we can be certain that before the rise of Mycene the *Ægean* was ruled from Knossos.

Any general description of those remains would be beyond the scope of this introduction. The reader must be referred to the volume which will shortly be published by Mr. Evans. It will be sufficient if a brief account is given of their importance for the beginnings of Greek history.

The traces of civilization at Knossos are as early as anything in Egypt. The Neolithic strata seem to go back to as far as the twelfth millennium before Christ. There are traces of connection

with Egypt from the fourth millenium onwards. The *Ægean* was then, as it was so often in later history, the meeting ground of the civilization of North and South. Mr. Evans distinguishes nine periods of Minoan civilization. Of these, the fifth, sixth, seventh and eighth are the period of the great palace and represent the Minoan thallassocracy of the *Ægean*. At the end of the eighth, presumably about 1600 B.C., the palace was destroyed, and Mycene took the place of Knossos as the centre of *Ægean* civilization. Somewhere about the ninth century this civilization was destroyed by iron-using conquerors from the North, who are presumably the Dorians of history.

Greek art therefore was not a new discovery. It was a renaissance, and Greek civilization and Greek religion had their roots in an immemorial past. The Greeks, as we know them in history, were not a homogeneous people who had come from the North into a previously uninhabited country. That a conquering race did come from the North on at least two different occasions is more than likely. They brought with them their language and imposed it and much else upon the earlier inhabitants. But the Greeks of history are a composite race, and they retained in their legends, in their religion, and in their art traces of their relation to the earlier civilizations of the *Ægean*. Those legends are no doubt largely mythical and unhistorical. But they have a historical foundation, and for the first part of Grote's history, which treats these legends as mere inventions of the poetic faculty of the Greeks, we must substitute the account which archæology gives us of the civilization of Crete and Mycene.

But for the history of Greece from the sixth century onward, Grote is still almost as valuable as ever. In the words of Canon Hicks, who has done as much as any one else to emphasize the importance of archæology for the historical period of Greece, "For most English students Grote's History is of paramount value. True that only in his later volumes does Grote awake to the importance of epigraphical evidence, and then he only cites it cautiously and at second hand. But from first to last the reader is brought face to face with the existing literary evidence. Herodotus, Thucydides, Xenophon, Demosthenes, acquire life and voice, and are made to tell us their own tale of what they themselves have seen and heard."

A. D. LINDSAY.

Oxford, 1906.

Bibliography

The following is a list of Grote's published works—

Statement of the Question of Parliamentary Reform, 1821 (summarised in Chapter I of "Minor Works"); Analysis of the Influence of Natural Religion on the Temporal Happiness of Mankind (published under the pseudonym of Philip Beauchamp), 1822; Essentials of Parliamentary Reform, 1831 (reprinted in "Minor Works"); Two Speeches on Vote by Ballot, 1833, 1836; Seven Letters on the Recent Politics of Switzerland (from the "Spectator"), 1847, 1876 (with additional Letter); History of Greece, 12 vols., 1846-1856 (several volumes were re-published before the completion of the whole work); Later Editions, 1862, 1869, 1872, 1888; Plato's Doctrine Concerning the Rotation of the Earth, and Aristotle's Comment upon that Doctrine, 1860 ("Minor Works"); Plato and the other Companions of Sokrates, 3 vols., 1865, 1867, 1874, 4 vols. 1885; ed. by A. Bain, 4 vols. 1888; Review of John Stuart Mill on the Philosophy of Sir William Hamilton (from "Westminster Review," 1866), 1868 ("Minor Works").

Posthumous Publications: Aristotle, ed. by A. Bain and G. C. Robertson, 2 vols., 1872, 1880 (the "Psychology of Aristotle" had already appeared in 1868 as an appendix to the third edition of Bain's "Senses and Intellect"; and the section on Universals in the same year as appendix to the same author's "Mental and Moral Science").

Poems, 1815-1822 (printed for private circulation 1872).

The Minor Works of George Grote, with Critical Remarks on his Intellectual Character, Writings, and Speeches, by A. Bain, 1873 (including, besides the articles already mentioned, a "Notice of Sir William Molesworth's edition of the Works of Hobbes," from the "Spectator," 1839; Grecian Legends and Early History, from the "Westminster Review," 1843; On Ancient Weights, Coins, and Measures, from the "Classical Museum," 1844; Presidential Address, In Commemoration of the Twenty-first Anniversary of the London Scientific Institution, 1846; Address on Delivering the Prizes at University College, 1846; Review of Sir G. C. Lewis on the Credibility of Early Roman History, from the "Edinburgh Review," 1856).

Posthumous Papers, printed for private circulation, 1874; Fragments on Ethical Subjects, a selection from Grote's Posthumous Papers, by A. Bain, 1876.

Personal Life of George Grote, by his widow, 1873.

PREFACE TO THE FIRST EDITION

THE first idea of this History was conceived many years ago, at a time when ancient Hellas was known to the English public chiefly through the pages of Mitford ; and my purpose in writing it was to rectify the erroneous statements as to matter of fact which that history contained, as well as to present the general phænomena of the Grecian world under what I thought a juster and more comprehensive point of view. My leisure however was not at that time equal to the execution of any large literary undertaking ; nor is it until within the last three or four years that I have been able to devote to the work that continuous and exclusive labour, without which, though much may be done to illustrate detached points, no entire or complicated subject can ever be set forth in a manner worthy to meet the public eye.

Meanwhile the state of the English literary world, in reference to ancient Hellas, has been materially changed in more ways than one. If my early friend Dr. Thirlwall's History of Greece had appeared a few years sooner, I should probably never have conceived the design of the present work at all ; I should certainly not have been prompted to the task by any deficiencies, such as those which I felt and regretted in Mitford. The comparison of the two authors affords indeed a striking proof of the progress of sound and enlarged views respecting the ancient world during the present generation. Having studied of course the same evidences as Dr. Thirlwall, I am better enabled than others to bear testimony to the learning, the sagacity, and the candour which pervade his excellent work ; and it is the more incumbent on me to give expression to this sentiment, since the particular points on which I shall have occasion to advert to it will unavoidably be points of dissent oftener than of coincidence.

The liberal spirit of criticism, in which Dr. Thirlwall stands so much distinguished from Mitford, is his own : there are other features of superiority which belong to him conjointly with his age.

For during the generation since Mitford's work, philological studies have been prosecuted in Germany with remarkable success : the stock of facts and documents, comparatively scanty, handed down from the ancient world, has been combined, and illustrated in a thousand different ways : and if our witnesses cannot be multiplied, we at least have numerous interpreters to catch, repeat, amplify and explain their broken and half-inaudible depositions. Some of the best writers in this department—Boeckh, Niebuhr, O. Müller—have been translated into our language ; so that the English public has been enabled to form some idea of the new lights thrown upon many subjects of antiquity by the inestimable aid of German erudition. The poets, historians, orators and philosophers of Greece, have thus been all rendered both more intelligible and more instructive than they were to a student in the last century ; and the general picture of the Grecian world may now be conceived with a degree of fidelity, which, considering our imperfect materials, it is curious to contemplate.

It is that general picture which an historian of Greece is required first to embody in his own mind, and next to lay out before his readers ;—a picture not merely such as to delight the imagination by brilliancy of colouring and depth of sentiment, but also suggestive and improving to the reason. Not omitting the points of resemblance as well as of contrast with the better-known forms of modern society, he will especially study to exhibit the spontaneous movement of Grecian intellect, sometimes aided but never borrowed from without, and lighting up a small portion of a world otherwise clouded and stationary. He will develope the action of that social system, which, while ensuring to the mass of freemen a degree of protection elsewhere unknown, acted as a stimulus to the creative impulses of genius, and left the superior minds sufficiently unshackled to soar above religious and political routine, to overshoot their own age, and to become the teachers of posterity.

To set forth the history of a people by whom the first spark was set to the dormant intellectual capacities of our nature—Hellenic phænomena as illustrative of the Hellenic mind and character—is the task which I propose to myself in the present work ; not without a painful consciousness how much the deed falls short of the will, and a yet more painful conviction, that full success is rendered impossible by an obstacle which no human ability can now remedy—the insufficiency of original evidence. For in spite of the valuable expositions of so many able commentators, our stock of information respecting the ancient world still remains lamentably

inadequate to the demands of an enlightened curiosity. We possess only what has drifted ashore from the wreck of a stranded vessel ; and though this includes some of the most precious articles amongst its once-abundant cargo, yet if any man will cast his eyes over the citations in Diogenes Laertius, Athenæus or Plutarch, or the list of names in Vossius de Historicis Græcis, he will see with grief and surprise how much larger is the proportion which, through the enslavement of the Greeks themselves, the decline of the Roman Empire, the change of religion, and the irruption of barbarian conquerors, has been irrecoverably submerged. We are thus reduced to judge of the whole Hellenic world, eminently multi-form as it was, from a few compositions ; excellent indeed in themselves, but bearing too exclusively the stamp of Athens. Of Thucydidēs and Aristotle indeed, both as inquirers into matter of fact and as free from narrow local feeling, it is impossible to speak too highly ; but unfortunately that work of the latter which would have given us the most copious information regarding Grecian political life—his collection and comparison of 150 distinct town-constitutions — has not been preserved ; while the brevity of Thucydidēs often gives us but a single word where a sentence would not have been too much, and sentences which we should be glad to see expanded into paragraphs.

Such insufficiency of original and trustworthy materials, as compared with those resources which are thought hardly sufficient for the historian of any modern kingdom, is neither to be concealed nor extenuated, however much we may lament it. I advert to the point here on more grounds than one. For it not only limits the amount of information which an historian of Greece can give to his readers—compelling him to leave much of his picture an absolute blank,—but it also greatly spoils the execution of the remainder. The question of credibility is perpetually obtruding itself, and requiring a decision, which, whether favourable or unfavourable, always introduces more or less of controversy ; and gives to those outlines, which the interest of the picture requires to be straight and vigorous, a faint and faltering character. Expressions of qualified and hesitating affirmation are repeated until the reader is sickened ; while the writer himself, to whom this restraint is more painful still, is frequently tempted to break loose from the unseen spell by which a conscientious criticism binds him down—to screw up the possible and probable into certainty, to suppress counterbalancing considerations, and to substitute a pleasing romance in place of half-known and perplexing realities. Desiring in the present work to set forth all which can be ascertained, together with such

conjectures and inferences as can be reasonably deduced from it, but nothing more—I notice at the outset that faulty state of the original evidence which renders discussions of credibility, and hesitation in the language of the judge, unavoidable. Such discussions, though the reader may be assured that they will become less frequent as we advance into times better known, are tiresome enough even with the comparatively late period which I adopt as the historical beginning; much more intolerable would they have proved had I thought it my duty to start from the primitive terminus of Deukalion or Inachus, or from the unburied Pelasgi and Leleges, and to subject the heroic ages to a similar scrutiny. I really know nothing so disheartening or unrequited as the elaborate balancing of what is called evidence—the comparison of infinitesimal probabilities and conjectures all uncertified—in regard to these shadowy times and persons.

The law respecting sufficiency of evidence ought to be the same for ancient times as for modern; and the reader will find in this history an application to the former, of criteria analogous to those which have been long recognised in the latter. Approaching, though with a certain measure of indulgence, to this standard, I begin the real history of Greece with the first recorded Olympiad, or 776 B.C. To such as are accustomed to the habits once universal, and still not uncommon, in investigating the ancient world, I may appear to be striking off one thousand years from the scroll of history; but to those whose canon of evidence is derived from Mr. Hallam, M. Sismondi, or any other eminent historian of modern events, I am well-assured that I shall appear lax and credulous rather than exigent or sceptical. For the truth is, that historical records, properly so called, do not begin until long after this date; nor will any man, who candidly considers the extreme paucity of attested facts for two centuries after 776 B.C., be astonished to learn that the state of Greece in 900, 1000, 1100, 1200, 1300, 1400 B.C., &c.—or any earlier century which it may please chronologists to include in their computed genealogies—cannot be described to him upon anything like decent evidence. I shall hope, when I come to the lives of Sokrates and Plato, to illustrate one of the most valuable of their principles—that conscious and confessed ignorance is a better state of mind, than the fancy, without the reality, of knowledge. Meanwhile I begin by making that confession, in reference to the real world of Greece anterior to the Olympiads; meaning the disclaimer to apply to anything like a general history,—not to exclude rigorously every individual event.

The times which I thus set apart from the region of history are discernible only through a different atmosphere—that of epic poetry and legend. To confound together these disparate matters is, in my judgement, essentially unphilosophical. I describe the earlier times by themselves, as conceived by the faith and feeling of the first Greeks, and known only through their legends—without presuming to measure how much or how little of historical matters these legends may contain. If the reader blame me for not assisting him to determine this—if he ask me why I do not undraw the curtain and disclose the picture—I reply in the words of the painter Zeuxis, when the same question was addressed to him on exhibiting his master-piece of imitative art—“*The curtain is the picture.*” What we now read as poetry and legend was once accredited history, and the only genuine history which the first Greeks could conceive or relish of their past time: the curtain conceals nothing behind, and cannot by any ingenuity be withdrawn. I undertake only to show it as it stands—not to efface, still less to re-paint it.

Three-fourths of the two volumes now presented to the public are destined to elucidate this age of historical faith, as distinguished from the later age of historical reason: to exhibit its basis in the human mind—an omnipresent religious and personal interpretation of nature; to illustrate it by comparison with the like mental habit in early modern Europe; to show its immense abundance and variety of narrative matter, with little care for consistency between one story and another; lastly, to set forth the causes which over-grew and partially supplanted the old *epical* sentiment, and introduced, in the room of literal faith, a variety of compromises and interpretations.

The legendary age of the Greeks receives its principal charm and dignity from the Homeric poems: to these, therefore, and to the other poems included in the ancient epic, an entire chapter is devoted, the length of which must be justified by the names of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*. I have thought it my duty to take some notice of the Wolfian controversy as it now stands in Germany, and have even hazarded some speculations respecting the structure of the *Iliad*. The society and manners of the heroic age, considered as known in a general way from Homer's descriptions and allusions, are also described and criticised.

I next pass to the historical age, beginning at 776 B.C.; prefixing some remarks upon the geographical features of Greece. I try to make out, amidst obscure and scanty indications, what the state of Greece was at this period; and I indulge some cautious conjectures,

founded upon the earliest verifiable facts, respecting the steps immediately antecedent by which that condition was brought about. In the present volumes I have only been able to include the history of Sparta and the Peloponnesian Dorians, down to the age of Peisistratus and Crœsus. I had hoped to have comprised in them the entire history of Greece down to this last-mentioned period, but I find the space insufficient.

The history of Greece falls most naturally into six compartments, of which the first may be looked at as a period of preparation for the five following, which exhaust the free life of collective Hellas.

I. Period from 776 B.C. to 560 B.C., the accession of Peisistratus at Athens and of Crœsus in Lydia.

II. From the accession of Peisistratus and Crœsus to the repulse of Xerxes from Greece.

III. From the repulse of Xerxes to the close of the Peloponnesian war and overthrow of Athens.

IV. From the close of the Peloponnesian war to the battle of Leuktra.

V. From the battle of Leuktra to that of Chæroneia.

VI. From the battle of Chæroneia to the end of the generation of Alexander.

The five periods from Peisistratus down to the death of Alexander and of his generation, present the acts of an historical drama capable of being recounted in perspicuous succession, and connected by a sensible thread of unity. I shall interweave in their proper places the important but outlying adventures of the Sicilian and Italian Greeks—introducing such occasional notices of Grecian political constitutions, philosophy, poetry, and oratory, as are requisite to exhibit the many-sided activity of this people during their short but brilliant career.

After the generation of Alexander, the political action of Greece becomes cramped and degraded—no longer interesting to the reader, or operative on the destinies of the future world. We may indeed name one or two incidents, especially the revolutions of Agis and Kleomenes at Sparta, which are both instructive and affecting; but as a whole, the period, between 300 B.C. and the absorption of Greece by the Romans, is of no interest in itself, and is only so far of value as it helps us to understand the preceding centuries. The dignity and value of the Greeks from that time forward belong to them only as individual philosophers, preceptors, astronomers and mathematicians, literary men and critics, medical practitioners, &c. In all these respective capacities, especially in

the great schools of philosophical speculation, they still constitute the light of the Roman world ; though as communities, they have lost their own orbit, and have become satellites of more powerful neighbours.

I propose to bring down the history of the Grecian communities to the year 300 B.C., or the close of the generation which takes its name from Alexander the Great, and I hope to accomplish this in eight volumes altogether. For the next two or three volumes I have already large preparations made, and I shall publish my third (perhaps my fourth) in the course of the ensuing winter.

There are great disadvantages in the publication of one portion of a history apart from the remainder ; for neither the earlier nor the later phænomena can be fully comprehended without the light which each mutually casts upon the other. But the practice has become habitual, and is indeed more than justified by the well-known inadmissibility of “long hopes” into the short span of human life. Yet I cannot but fear that my first two volumes will suffer in the estimation of many readers by coming out alone—and that men who value the Greeks for their philosophy, their politics, and their oratory, may treat the early legends as not worth attention. And it must be confessed that the sentimental attributes of the Greek mind—its religious and poetical vein—here appear in disproportionate relief, as compared with its more vigorous and masculine capacities—with those powers of acting, organising, judging, and speculating, which will be revealed in the forthcoming volumes. I venture however to forewarn the reader that there will occur numerous circumstances in the after political life of the Greeks which he will not comprehend unless he be initiated into the course of their legendary associations. He will not understand the frantic terror of the Athenian public during the Peloponnesian war, on the occasion of the mutilation of the statues called Hermæ, unless he enters into the way in which they connected their stability and security with the domiciliation of the gods in the soil ; nor will he adequately appreciate the habit of the Spartan king on military expeditions,—when he offered his daily public sacrifices on behalf of his army and his country,—“always to perform this morning service immediately before sunrise, in order that he might be beforehand in obtaining the favour of the gods,”¹ if he be not familiar with the Homeric conception of Zeus going to rest at night and awaking to rise at early dawn from the side of the “white-

¹ Xenophon, *Repub. Lacedæmon.*, cap. xiii. 3. ‘Αεὶ δὲ, ὅταν θύηται, ἀρχεται μὲν τούτου τοῦ ἔργου ἔτι κνεφαῖος, προλαμβάνειν βουλόμενος τὴν τοῦ θεοῦ εἴνοισαν.

armed Hérâ." The occasion will indeed often occur for remarking how these legends illustrate and vivify the political phænomena of the succeeding times, and I have only now to urge the necessity of considering them as the beginning of a series,—not as an entire work.

London, March 5, 1846.

PREFACE

TO THE SECOND EDITION OF VOLUMES I AND II

IN preparing a Second Edition of the two First Volumes of my History, I have profited by the remarks and corrections of various critics, contained in Reviews both English and Foreign. I have suppressed, or rectified, some positions which had been pointed out as erroneous, or as advanced upon inadequate evidence. I have strengthened my argument in some cases where it appeared to have been imperfectly understood—adding some new notes, partly for the purpose of enlarged illustration, partly to defend certain opinions which had been called in question. The greater number of these alterations have been made in Chapters XVI. and XXI. of Part I.—and in Chapter VI. of Part II.

I trust that these three Chapters, more full of speculation, and therefore more open to criticism than any of the others, will thus appear in a more complete and satisfactory form. But I must at the same time add that they remain for the most part unchanged in substance, and that I have seen no sufficient reason to modify my main conclusions even respecting the structure of the *Iliad*, controverted though they have been by some of my most esteemed critics.

In regard to the character and peculiarity of Grecian legend, as broadly distinguished throughout these volumes from Grecian history, I desire to notice two valuable publications with which I have only become acquainted since the date of my first edition. One of these is, a short *Essay on Primæval History*, by John Kenrick, M.A. (London 1846, published just at the same time as these volumes), which illustrates with much acute reflection the general features of legend, not only in Greece but throughout the ancient world—see especially pages 65, 84, 92, *et seq.* The other work is, *Rambles and Recollections of an Indian Official*, by Colonel Sleeman—first made known to me through an excellent notice of my History in the *Edinburgh Review* for October 1846. The description given by Colonel Sleeman, of the state of mind now actually prevalent among the native population of Hindostan,

presents a vivid comparison, helping the modern reader to understand and appreciate the legendary æra of Greece. I have embodied in the notes of this Second Edition two or three passages from Colonel Sleeman's instructive work: but the whole of it richly deserves perusal.

Having now finished six volumes of this History, without attaining a lower point than the peace of Nikias in the tenth year of the Peloponnesian war—I find myself compelled to retract the expectation held out in the preface to my First Edition, that the entire work might be completed in eight volumes. Experience proves to me how impossible it is to measure beforehand the space which historical subjects will require. All I can now promise is, that the remainder of the work shall be executed with as much regard to brevity as is consistent with the paramount duty of rendering it fit for public acceptance.

G. G.

London, April 3, 1849.

NAMES OF GODS, GODDESSES, AND HEROES

FOLLOWING the example of Dr. Thirlwall and other excellent scholars, I call the Greek deities by their real Greek names, and not by the Latin equivalents used among the Romans. For the assistance of those readers to whom the Greek names may be less familiar, I here annex a table of the one and the other.

<i>Greek.</i>	<i>Latin.</i>
Zeus,	Jupiter.
Poseidôn,	Neptune.
Arês,	Mars.
Dionysus,	Bacchus.
Hermês,	Mercury.
Hêlios,	Sol.
Hêphæstus,	Vulcan.
Hadês,	Pluto.
Hêrê,	Juno.
Athênenê,	Minerva.
Artemis,	Diana.
Aphroditê,	Venus.
Eôs,	Aurora.
Hestia,	Vesta.
Lêtô,	Latona.
Dêmêtêr,	Ceres.
Hêraklês,	Hercules.
Asklépius,	Æsculapius.

A few words are here necessary respecting the orthography of Greek names adopted in the above table and generally throughout this history. I have approximated as nearly as I dared to the Greek letters in preference to the Latin; and on this point I venture upon an innovation which I should have little doubt of vindicating before the reason of any candid English student. For the ordinary practice of substituting, in a Greek name, the English

xxvi Names of Gods and Goddesses

C in place of the Greek K is indeed so obviously incorrect, that it admits of no rational justification. Our own K precisely and in every point coincides with the Greek K: we have thus the means of reproducing the Greek name to the eye as well as to the ear, yet we gratuitously take the wrong letter in preference to the right. And the precedent of the Latins is here against us rather than in our favour, for their C really coincided in sound with the Greek K, whereas our C entirely departs from it, and becomes an S, before *e*, *i*, *æ*, *œ*, and *y*. Though our C has so far deviated in sound from the Latin C, yet there is some warrant for our continuing to use it in writing Latin names—because we thus reproduce the name to the eye, though not to the ear. But this is not the case when we employ our C to designate the Greek K, for we depart here not less from the visible than from the audible original; while we mar the unrivalled euphony of the Greek language by that multiplied sibilation which constitutes the least inviting feature in our own. Among German philologists the K is now universally employed in writing Greek names, and I have adopted it pretty largely in this work, making exceptions for such names as the English reader has been so accustomed to hear with the C, that they may be considered as being almost Anglicised. I have further marked the long *e* and the long *o* (*η*, *ω*) by a circumflex (Hērē) when they occur in the last syllable or in the penultimate of a name.

CONTENTS OF VOL. I

PART I.—LEGENDARY GREECE

CHAPTER I	PAGE	PAGE	
LEGENDS RESPECTING THE GODS			
Opening of the mythical world	1	Ecstatic rites introduced from Asia	
How the mythes are to be told	<i>ib.</i>	700-500 B.C.	25
Allegory rarely admissible	2	Connected with the worship of Dionysos	<i>ib.</i>
Zeus—foremost in Grecian conception	<i>ib.</i>	Thracian and Egyptian influence upon Greece	26
The gods—how conceived: human type enlarged	3	Encouragement to mystic legends	28
Past history of the gods fitted on to present conceptions	<i>ib.</i>	Melampus the earliest name as teacher of the Dionysiac rites	29
Gæa and Uranos	4	Orphic sect, a variety of the Dionysiac mystics	<i>ib.</i>
Urano disabled	<i>ib.</i>	Contrast of the mysteries with the Homeric Hymns	30
Kronos and the Titans	5	Hymn to Dionysos	31
Kronos overreached. Birth and safety of Zeus and his brethren	<i>ib.</i>	Alteration of the primitive Grecian idea of Dionysos	32
Other deities	6	Asiatic frenzy grafted on the joviality of the Grecian Dionysia	33
Ambitious schemes of Zeus	7	Eleusinian mysteries	<i>ib.</i>
Victory of Zeus and his brethren over Kronos and the Titans	<i>ib.</i>	Homeric Hymn to Démêtér	35
Typhoëus	8	Temple of Eleusis, built by order of Démêtér for her residence	36
Dynasty of Zeus	<i>ib.</i>	Démêtér prescribes the mystic ritual of Eleusis	37
His offspring	<i>ib.</i>	Homeric Hymn a sacred Eleusinian record	<i>ib.</i>
General distribution of the divine race	9	Explanatory of the details of divine service	38
Hesiodic theogony—its authority	10	Importance of the mysteries to the town of Eleusis	<i>ib.</i>
Points of difference between Homer and Hesiod	<i>ib.</i>	Strong hold of the legend upon Eleusinian feelings	<i>ib.</i>
Homeric Zeus	11	Different legends respecting Démêtér elsewhere	39
Amplified theogony of Zeus	12	Expansion of the legends	<i>ib.</i>
Hesiodic mythes traceable to Krête and Delphi	13	Hellenic importance of Démêtér	40
Orphic theogony	15	Legends of Apollo	<i>ib.</i>
Zeus and Phanés	<i>ib.</i>	Delian Apollo	<i>ib.</i>
Zagreus	17	Pythian Apollo	42
Comparison of Hesiod and Orpheus	18	Foundation legend of the Delphian oracle	43
Influence of foreign religions upon Greece	19	They served the purpose of historical explanation	44
Especially in regard to the worship of Démêtér and Dionysos	20	Extended worship of Apollo	<i>ib.</i>
Purification for homicide unknown to Homer	22	Multifarious local legends respecting Apollo	45
New and peculiar religious rites	23	Festivals and Agones	46
Circulated by voluntary teachers and promising special blessings	<i>ib.</i>		
Epimenides, Sibylla, Bakis	25		
Principal mysteries of Greece	<i>ib.</i>		

	PAGE
State of mind and circumstances out of which Grecian mythes arose	46
Discrepancies in the legends little noticed	47
Aphrodítē	48
Athénē.	49
Artemis	ib.
Poseidôn	50
Stories of temporary servitude imposed on gods	51
Hérē	52
Héphaestos	ib.
Hestia	ib.
Hermès	ib.
Hermès inventor of the lyre	53
Bargain between Hermès and Apollo	ib.
Expository value of the Hymn	54
Zeus	55
Mythes arising out of the religious ceremonies	ib.
Small part of the animal sacrificed	56
Prométheus had outwitted Zeus.	ib.
Gods, Heroes, and men, appear together in the mythes	57
CHAPTER II	
LEGENDS RELATING TO HEROES AND MEN	
Races of men as they appear in the Hesiodic "Works and Days".	58
The Golden.	ib.
The Silver	59
The Brazen	ib.
The Heroic.	ib.
The Iron	ib.
Different both from the Theogony and from Homer	60
Explanation of this difference	ib.
Ethical vein of sentiment	61
Intersected by the mythical	ib.
The "Works and Days" earliest didactic poem	62
First introduction of dæmons	63
Changes in the idea of dæmons	ib.
Employed in attacks on the pagan faith.	64
Functions of the Hesiodic dæmons	ib.
Personal feeling which pervades the "Works and Days".	ib.
Probable age of the poem	65
CHAPTER III	
LEGEND OF THE IAPETIDS	
Iapetids in Hesiod	66
Prométheus and Epimétheus	ib.
Counter-maneuvring of Prométheus and Zeus	ib.
Pandôra	67
Pandôra in the Theogony	68
General feeling of the poet	ib.
Man wretched, but Zeus not to blame	69
Mischiefs arising from women	69
Punishment of Prométheus	ib.
The Prométheus of Aeschylus	70
Locality in which Prométheus was confined	71
CHAPTER IV	
HEROIC LEGENDS—GENEALOGY OF ARGOS	
Structure and purposes of Grecian genealogies	72
To connect the Grecian community with their common god	ib.
Lower members of the genealogy historical—higher members non-historical	ib.
The non-historical portion equally believed, and most valued, by the Greeks	73
Number of such genealogies—prevading every fraction of Greeks	ib.
Argive genealogy—Inachus	ib.
Phorðneus	74
Argos Panoptés	ib.
Iô	75
Romance of Iô historicised by Persians and Phoenicians	76
Legendary abductions of heroines adapted to the feelings prevalent during the Persian war	ib.
Danaos and the Danaïdes	78
Akrisios and Proctos	79
The Proctides cured of frenzy by Melampus	ib.
Akrisios, Danaé and Zeus	80
Perseus and the Gorgons	ib.
Foundation of Mykénæ—commencement of Perseid dynasty	81
Amphitryôn, Alkméné, Sthenelos	ib.
Zeus and Alkméné	82
Birth of Héraklês	83
Homeric legend of his birth: its expository value	ib.
The Hérakleids expelled	84
Their recovery of Peloponnesus, and establishment in Argos, Sparta, and Messénia	ib.
CHAPTER V	
DEUKALION, HELLEN, AND SONS OF HELLEN	
Deukaliôn, son of Prométheus	85
Phthiotis: his permanent seat	86
General deluge.—Salvation of Deukaliôn and Pyrrha	ib.
Belief in this deluge throughout Greece	ib.
Hellén and Amphiktyôn	87
Sons of Hellén: Dôrus, Xuthus, Aëolus	88
Amphiktyonic assembly.—Common solemnities and games	89
Division of Hellas: Aëolians, Dôrians, Iônians	ib.

Contents

XXIX

PAGE	PAGE			
Large extent of Dōris implied in this genealogy	90	Althaea and the burning brand	126	
This form of the legend harmonises with the great establishments of the historical Dōrians	91	Grand Kalydonian boar-hunt—Atalanta	127	
Achæus—purpose which his name serves in the legend	92	Relics of the boar long preserved at Tegea	128	
Genealogical diversities	93	Atalanta vanquished in the race by stratagem	129	
CHAPTER VI				
THE ÆOLIDS, OR SONS AND DAUGHTERS OF ÆOLUS		CHAPTER VII		
Legends of Greece, originally isolated, afterwards thrown into series	94	Misfortunes and celebrity of the Pelopids	134	
Æolus	ib.	Pelops—eponym of Peloponnēsus	ib.	
His seven sons and five daughters	95	Deduction of the sceptre of Pelops	135	
First Æolid line—Salmōneus, Tyro	ib.	Kingly attributes of the family	136	
Pelias and Néleus	97	Homeric Pelops	ib.	
Pérō, Bias, and Melampus	ib.	Lydia, Pisa, &c., post-Homeric additions	137	
Periklymenos	98	Tantalus	ib.	
Nestōr and his exploits	ib.	Niobē	ib.	
Néleids down to Kodrus	99	Pelope and Ænomaus, king of Pisa	138	
Second Æolid line—Krētheus	100	Chariot victory of Pelops—his principality at Pisa	139	
Admētus and Alkéstis	ib.	Atreus, Thyestēs, Chrysippus	ib.	
Péleus and the wife of Akastus	101	Family horrors among the Pelopids	140	
Pelias and Jasōn	102	Agamemnōn and Menelaus	ib.	
Jasōn and Médeá	ib.	Orestēs	142	
Médeá at Corinth	103	The goddess Hérē and Mykénæ	ib.	
Third Æolid line—Sisyphus	105	Legendary importance of Mykénæ	143	
Corinthian genealogy of Eumēlūs	106	Its decline coincident with the rise of Argos and Sparta	144	
Coalescence of different legends about Médeá and Sisyphus	107	Agamemnōn and Orestēs transferred to Sparta	145	
Bellerophōn	108	CHAPTER VIII		
Fourth Æolid line—Athamas	109	LACONIAN AND MESSENIAN GENEALOGIES		
Phryxus and Hellē	ib.	Lelex—antochthonous in Lacōnia	146	
Inō and Palæmōn.—Isthmian games	ib.	Tyndareus and Léda	ib.	
Local root of the legend of Athamas	110	Offspring of Léda—1. Kastōr, Ti-mandra, Klytaemnēstra. 2. Pollux, Helen	147	
Traces of ancient human sacrifices	111	Kastōr and Pollux	ib.	
Athamas in the district near Orchomenos	112	Legend of the Attic Dekelia	148	
Eteoklēs—festival of the Charitēsia	113	Idas and Lynkeus	ib.	
Foundation and greatness of Orchomenos	114	Great functions and power of the Dios-kuri	149	
Overthrown by Héraklēs and the Thébans	ib.	Messénian genealogy	ib.	
Trophōnios and Agamēdēs	ib.	Periérēs—Idas and Marpēssa	ib.	
Askalaphos and Ialmenos	115	CHAPTER IX		
Discrepancies in the Orchomenian genealogy	ib.	ARCADIAN GENEALOGY		
Probable inferences as to the antehistorical Orchomenos	116	Pelasgus	150	
Its early wealth and industry	117	Lykaōn and his fifty sons	ib.	
Emissaries of the lake Kōpais	ib.	Legend of Lykaōn—fertility punished by the gods	151	
Old Amphiktyony at Kalauria	118			
Orchomenos and Thébes	119			
Alcyone and Kéyx	120			
Kanakē—the Alōids	ib.			
Kalykē—Elis and Ætolia—Eleian genealogy	121			
Augēas	122			
The Molonid brothers	123			
Æolian genealogy	124			
Œneus, Meleager, Tydeus	ib.			
Legend of Meleager in Homer	125			
How altered by poets after Homer	ib.			

	PAGE
Deep religious faith of Pausanias	152
His view of past and present world	ib.
Kallistō and Arkas	ib.
Azan, Apheidas, Elatus	153
Aleus, Augē, Télephus	ib.
Ankæus—Echemus	154
Echemus kills Hyllus—Hérakleids repelled from Peloponéssus	ib.
Korðnis and Asklépius	ib.
Extended worship of Asklépius—numerous legends	155
Machaōn and Podaleirius	156
Numerous Asklépiads, or descendants from Asklépius	157
Temples of Asklépius—sick persons healed there	158
Glorious achievements of the Amazons	
Their ubiquity	
Universally received as a portion of the Greek past	
Amazons produced as present by the historians of Alexander	
Conflict of faith and reason in the historical critics	
182	
183	
184	
ib.	
185	

CHAPTER X

ÆAKUS AND HIS DESCENDANTS—ÆGINA, SALAMIS AND PHTHIA	
Æakus—son of Zeus and Ægina	159
Offspring of Æakus—Pélæus, Telamōn, Phôkus	160
Prayers of Æakus—procure relief for Greece	ib.
Phôkus killed by Pélæus and Telamōn	161
Telamōn, banished, goes to Salamis	ib.
Pélæus—goes to Phthia—his marriage with Thetis	162
Neoptolemus	163
Ajax—his son Phîlæus the eponymous hero of a dème in Attica	164
Teukrus banished, settles in Cyprus	ib.
Diffusion of the Æakid genealogy	ib.

CHAPTER XI

ATTIC LEGENDS AND GENEALOGIES	
Erechtheus—autochthonous	165
Attic legends—originally from different roots—each déme had its own	166
Little noticed by the old epic poets	167
Kekrops	168
Kranaus—Pandiōn	169
Daughters of Pandiōn—Proknē, Philoméla. Legend of Téreus	170
Daughters of Erechtheus—Prokris	171
Kreüsa.—Oréithyia, the wife of Boreas—his gracious help in their danger	172
Erechtheus and Eumolpus	173
Voluntary self-sacrifice of the three daughters of Erechtheus	174
Kreüsa and Iōn	176
Sons of Pandiōn—Ægeus, &c.	ib.
Théseus	177
His legendary character refined	178
Plutarch—his way of handling the matter of legend	ib.
Legend of the Amazons	180
Its antiquity and prevalence	182

CHAPTER XII

KRETAN LEGENDS—MINOS AND HIS FAMILY

Minōs and Rhadamanthus, sons of Zeus	188
Europe	189
Passiphæ and Minōtaur	190
Scylla and Nisus	ib.
Death of Androgeos, and anger of Minōs against Athens	191
Athenian victims for the Minōtaur	ib.
Self-devotion of Théseus—he kills the Minōtaur. Ariadnē	ib.
Athenian commemorative ceremonies	192
Family of Minōs	193
Minōs and Dædalus—flight of the latter to Sicily	194
Minōs goes to retake him, but is killed	ib.
Semi-Krétan settlements elsewhere—connected with this voyage of Minōs	195
Sufferings of the Krétans afterwards from the wrath of Minōs	ib.
Portrait of Minōs—how varied	196
Affinity between Krète and Asia Minor	199

CHAPTER XIII

ARGONAUTIC EXPEDITION

Ship Argō in the Odyssey	199
In Hesiod and Eumélus	200
Jasōn and his heroic companions	ib.
Lémnos	202
Adventures at Kyzikus, in Bithynia, &c. Héraklēs and Hylas. Phineus	ib.
Dangers of the Symplégades	203
Arrival at Kolchis	204
Conditions imposed by Ætēs as the price of the golden fleece	ib.
Perfidy of Ætēs—flight of the Argonauts and Médea with the fleece	205
Pursuit of Ætēs—the Argonauts saved by Médea	ib.
Return of the Argonauts—circuitous and perilous	206
Numerous and wide-spread monuments referring to the voyage	208
Argonautic legend generally	210
Fabulous geography—gradually modified as real geographical knowledge increased	211
Transposition of epic localities	212

	PAGE
How and when the Argonautic voyage became attached to Kolchis	216
Æêtés and Circé	ib.
Return of the Argonauts—different versions	218
Continued faith in the voyage—basis of truth determined by Strabo	220

CHAPTER XIV

LEGENDS OF THEBES

Abundant legends of Thébes	221
Amphiôn and Zethus Homeric founders of Kadmus and Bœotus—both distinct legends. Thébes	222
How Thébes was founded by Kadmus	223
Five primitive families at Thébes called Sparti	224
The four daughters of Kadmus—1. Inô	ib.
2. Semelé	ib.
3. Autonoë and her son Aktæôn	225
4. Agavé and her son Pentheus	226
He resists the god Dionysus—his miserable end	ib.
Labdakus, Antiopé, Amphiôn and Zethus	227
Laius—Œdipus—Legendary celebrity of Œdipus and his family	ib.
The Sphinx	230
Eteoklés and Polynikés	231
Old epic poems on the sieges of Thebés	232

SIEGES OF THEBES

Curse pronounced by the devoted Œdipus upon his sons	233
Novelties introduced by Sophoklés	234
Death of Œdipus—quarrel of Eteoklés and Polynikés for the sceptre	235
Polynikés retires to Argos—aid given to him by Adrastus	ib.
Amphiaraüs and Eriphylé	ib.
Seven chiefs of the army against Thébes	236
Defeat of the Thébans in the field—heroic devotion of Menœkeus	ib.
Single combat of Eteoklés and Polynikés, in which both perish	237
Repulse and destruction of the Argivean chiefs—all except Adrastus. Amphiaraüs is swallowed up in the earth	238
Kreôn, king of Thébes, forbids the burial of Polynikés and the other fallen Argivean chiefs	239
Devotion and death of Antigonê	ib.
The Athenians interfere to procure the interment of the fallen chiefs	ib.
Second siege of Thébes by Adrastus with the Epigoni, or sons of those slain in the first	240
Victory of the Epigoni—capture of Thébes	241

CHAPTER XV

LEGEND OF TROY

	PAGE
Worship of Adrastus at Síkyôn—how abrogated by Kleisthenés	241
Alkmæôn—his matricide and punishment	242
Fatal necklace of Eriphylé	243
CHAPTER XV	
LEGEND OF TROY	
Great extent and variety of the tale of Troy	245
Dardanus, son of Zeus	246
Iliu, founder of Ilium	ib.
Walls of Ilium built by Poseidôn	247
Capture of Ilium by Héraklés	ib.
Priam and his offspring	ib.
Paris—his judgement on the three goddesses	248
Carrries off Helen from Sparta	249
Expedition of the Greeks to recover her	250
Heroes from all parts of Greece combined under Agamemnôn	ib.
Achilles and Odysseus	251
The Grecian host mistakes Teuthrania for Troy—Telephus	253
Detention of the Greeks at Aulis—Agamemnôn and Iphigeneia	ib.
First success of the Greeks on landing near Troy. Briséis awarded to Achilles	254
Palamédés—his genius and treacherous death	255
Epic chronology—historicised	256
Period of the Homeric Iliad. Hector killed by Achilles	257
New allies of Troy—Penthesileia	258
Memnôn—killed by Achilles	ib.
Death of Achilles	259
Funeral games celebrated in honour of him—Quarrel about his panoply—Odysseus prevails and Ajax kills himself	ib.
Philoktétés and Neoptolemus	260
Capture of the Palladium.—The wooden horse	261
Destruction of Troy	263
Distribution of the captives among the victors	264
Helen restored to Menelaus—lives in dignity at Sparta—passes to a happy immortality	ib.
Blindness and cure of the poet Stesichorus—alteration of the legend about Helen	265
Egyptian tale about Helen—tendency to historicise	266
Return of the Greeks from Troy	267
Their sufferings—anger of the gods	268
Wanderings of the heroes in all directions	269
Memorials of them throughout the Grecian world	ib.
Odysseus—his final adventures and death	272
Æneas and his descendants	ib.

Contents

	PAGE
Different stories about <i>Æneas</i> .— <i>Æneads</i> at Sképsis	273
Ubiquity of <i>Æneas</i>	274
Antenor	275
Tale of Troy—its magnitude and discrepancies	276
Trojan war—essentially legendary— its importance as an item in Grecian national faith	<i>ib.</i>
Basis of history for it—possible, and nothing more	277
Historicising innovations—Dio Chrysostom	278
Historical Ilium	279
Generally received and visited as the town of Priam	<i>ib.</i>
Respect shown to it by Alexander	281
Successors of Alexander—foundation of Alexandria Trōas	<i>ib.</i>
The Romans treat Ilium with marked respect	282
Mythical legitimacy of Ilium—first called in question by Démétrius of Sképsis and Hestiae	283
Supposed Old Ilium, or real Troy, distinguished from New Ilium	284
Strabo alone believes in Old Ilium as the real Troy—other authors continue in the old faith—the moderns follow Strabo	<i>ib.</i>
The mythical faith not shaken by topographical impossibilities	285
Historical Trōas and the Teukrians	288
Æolic Greeks in the Trōad—the whole territory gradually Æolised	289
Old date, and long prevalence of the worship of Apollo Smynthius	291
Asiatic customs and religion—blended with Hellenic	<i>ib.</i>
Sibylline prophecies	292
Settlements from Milétus, Mitylénē, and Athens	293

HISTORY OF GREECE

PART I LEGENDARY GREECE

CHAPTER I

LEGENDS RESPECTING THE GODS

THE mythical world of the Greeks opens with the gods, anterior as well as superior to man: it gradually descends, first to heroes, and next to the human race. Along with the gods are found various monstrous natures, ultra-human and extra-human, who cannot with propriety be called gods, but who partake with gods and men in the attributes of volition, conscious agency, and susceptibility of pleasure and pain,—such as the Harpies, the Gorgons, the Grææ, the Sirens, Scylla and Charybdis, Echidna, Sphinx, Chimæra, Chrysaor, Pegasus, the Cyclôpes, the Centaurs, &c. The first acts of what may be termed the great mythical cycle describe the proceedings of these gigantic agents—the crash and collision of certain terrific and overboiling forces, which are ultimately reduced to obedience, or chained up, or extinguished, under the more orderly government of Zeus, who supplants his less capable predecessors, and acquires presidence and supremacy over gods and men—subject however to certain social restraints from the chief gods and goddesses around him, as well as to the custom of occasionally convoking and consulting the divine agora.

I recount these events briefly, but literally, treating them simply as mythes springing from the same creative imagination, addressing themselves to analogous tastes and feelings, and depending upon the same authority, as the legends of Thebes and Troy. It is the inspired voice of the Muse which reveals and authenticates both, and from which Homer and Hesiod alike derive their knowledge—the one, of the heroic, the

other, of the divine, foretime. I maintain, moreover, fully, the character of these great divine agents as Persons, which is the light in which they presented themselves to the Homeric or Hesiodic audience. Uranos, Nyx, Hypnos and Oneiros (Heaven, Night, Sleep and Dream), are Persons, just as much as Zeus and Apollo. To resolve them into mere allegories, is unsafe and unprofitable: we then depart from the point of view of the original hearers, without acquiring any consistent or philosophical point of view of our own.¹ For although some of the attributes and actions ascribed to these persons are often explicable by allegory, the whole series and system of them never are so: the theorist who adopts this course of explanation finds that, after one or two simple and obvious steps, the path is no longer open, and he is forced to clear a way for himself by gratuitous refinements and conjectures. The allegorical persons and attributes are always found mingled with other persons and attributes not allegorical; but the two classes cannot be severed without breaking up the whole march of the mythical events, nor can any explanation which drives us to such a necessity be considered as admissible. To suppose indeed that these legends could be all traced by means of allegory into a coherent body of physical doctrine, would be inconsistent with all reasonable presumptions respecting the age or society in which they arose. Where the allegorical mark is clearly set upon any particular character, or attribute, or event, to that extent we may recognise it; but we can rarely venture to divine further, still less to alter the legends themselves on the faith of any such surmises. The theogony of the Greeks contains some cosmogonic ideas; but it cannot be considered as a system of cosmogony, or translated into a string of elementary, planetary, or physical changes.

In the order of legendary chronology, Zeus comes after Kronos and Uranos; but in the order of Grecian conception, Zeus is the prominent person, and Kronos and Uranos are inferior and introductory precursors, set up in order to be overthrown and to serve as mementos of the prowess of their conqueror. To Homer and Hesiod, as well as to the Greeks universally, Zeus is the great and predominant god, "the father of gods and men," whose power none of the other gods can hope to resist, or even deliberately think of questioning. All the other gods have their specific potency and peculiar sphere of action and duty, with which Zeus does not usually interfere;

¹ It is sufficient, here, to state this position briefly: more will be said respecting the allegorising interpretation in a future chapter.

but it is he who maintains the lineaments of a providential superintendence, as well over the phænomena of Olympus as over those of earth. Zeus and his brothers Poseidôn and Hadês have made a division of power: he has reserved the aether and the atmosphere to himself—Poseidôn has obtained the sea—and Hadês the under-world or infernal regions; while earth, and the events which pass upon earth, are common to all of them, together with free access to Olympus.¹

Zeus, then, with his brethren and colleagues, constitute the present gods, whom Homer and Hesiod recognise as in full dignity and efficiency. The inmates of this divine world are conceived upon the model, but not upon the scale, of the human. They are actuated by the full play and variety of those appetites, sympathies, passions and affections, which divide the soul of man; invested with a far larger and indeterminate measure of power, and an exemption as well from death as (with some rare exceptions) from suffering and infirmity. The rich and diverse types thus conceived, full of energetic movement and contrast, each in his own province, and soaring confessedly above the limits of experience, were of all themes the most suitable for adventure and narrative, and operated with irresistible force upon the Grecian fancy. All nature was then conceived as moving and working through a number of personal agents, amongst whom the gods of Olympus were the most conspicuous; the reverential belief in Zeus and Apollo being only one branch of this omnipresent personifying faith. The attributes of all these agents had a tendency to expand themselves into illustrative legends—especially those of the gods, who were constantly invoked in the public worship. Out of the same mental source sprang both the divine and heroic mythes—the former being often the more extravagant and abnormous in their incidents, in proportion as the general type of the gods was more vast and awful than that of the heroes.

As the gods have houses and wives like men, so the present dynasty of gods must have a past to repose upon;² and the curious and imaginative Greek, whenever he does not find a recorded past ready to his hand, is uneasy until he has created

¹ See Iliad, viii. 405, 463; xv. 20, 130, 185. Hesiod, Theog. 885.

This unquestioned supremacy is the general representation of Zeus: at the same time the conspiracy of Hérê, Poseidôn, and Athénê against him, suppressed by the unexpected apparition of Briareus as his ally, is among the exceptions. (Iliad, i. 400.) Zeus is at one time vanquished by Titan, but rescued by Hermès. (Apollodôr. i. 6, 3.)

² Arist. Polit. i. 1. ὥσπερ δὲ καὶ τὰ εἴδη ἑαυτοῖς ἀφομοιοῦσιν ἀνθρωποι, οὕτως καὶ τοὺς θλούς, τῶν θεῶν.

one. Thus the Hesiodic theogony explains, with a certain degree of system and coherence, first the antecedent circumstances under which Zeus acquired the divine empire, next the number of his colleagues and descendants.

First in order of time (we are told by Hesiod) came Chaos; next Gaea, the broad, firm, and flat Earth, with deep and dark Tartarus at her base. Erôs (Love), the subduer of gods as well as men, came immediately afterwards.¹

From Chaos sprung Erebus and Nyx; from these latter \mathcal{A} ethér and Hêmera. Gaea also gave birth to Uranos, equal in breadth to herself, in order to serve both as an overarching vault to her, and as a residence for the immortal gods; she further produced the mountains, habitations of the divine nymphs, and Pontus, the barren and billowy sea.

Then Gaea intermarried with Uranos, and from this union came a numerous offspring—twelve Titans and Titanides, three Cyclôpes, and three Hekatoncheires or beings with a hundred hands each. The Titans were Oceanus, Kœos, Krios, Hyperion, Iapetos, and Kronos: the Titanides, Theia, Rhea, Themis, Mnemosynê, Phœbê, and Têthys. The Cyclôpes were Brontês, Steropês, and Argês,—formidable persons, equally distinguished for strength and for manual craft, so that they made the thunder which afterwards formed the irresistible artillery of Zeus.² The Hekatoncheires were Kottos, Briareus, and Gygês, of prodigious bodily force.

Uranos contemplated this powerful brood with fear and horror; as fast as any of them were born, he concealed them in cavities of the earth, and would not permit them to come out. Gaea could find no room for them, and groaned under the pressure: she produced iron, made a sickle, and implored her sons to avenge both her and themselves against the oppressive treatment of their father. But none of them, except Kronos, had courage to undertake the deed: he, the youngest and the most daring, was armed with the sickle and placed in suitable ambush by the contrivance of Gaea. Presently night arrived, and Uranos descended to the embraces of Gaea: Kronos then emerged from his concealment, cut off the genitals of his father, and cast the bleeding member behind him far away into the sea.³ Much of the blood was spilt upon the earth, and Gaea in consequence gave birth to the irresistible

¹ Hesiod, Theog. 116. Apollodorus begins with Uranos and Gaea (i. 1); he does not recognise Erôs, Nyx, or Erebus.

² Hesiod, Theog. 140, 156. Apollod. *ut sup.*

³ Hesiod, Theog. 160, 182. Apollod. i. 1, 4.

Erinnys, the vast and muscular Gigantes, and the Melian nymphs. Out of the genitals themselves, as they swam and foamed upon the sea, emerged the goddess Aphrodítē, deriving her name from the foam out of which she had sprung. She first landed at Kythêra, and then went to Cyprus: the island felt her benign influence, and the green herb started up under her soft and delicate tread. Erôs immediately joined her, and partook with her the function of suggesting and directing the amorous impulses both of gods and men.¹

Uranos being thus dethroned and disabled, Kronos and the Titans acquired their liberty and became predominant: the Cyclôpes and the Hekatoncheires had been cast by Uranos into Tartarus, and were still allowed to remain there.

Each of the Titans had a numerous offspring: Oceanus, especially, marrying his sister Têthys, begat three thousand daughters, the Oceanic nymphs, and as many sons: the rivers and springs passed for his offspring. Hyperiôn and his sister Theia had for their children Hêlios, Selênê, and Eôs; Kœos with Phœbê begat Lêtô and Asteria: the children of Krios were Astræos, Pallas, and Persês,—from Astræos and Eôs sprang the winds Zephyrus, Boreas, and Notus. Iapetos marrying the Oceanic nymph Klymenê, counted as his progeny the celebrated Prométheus, Epimêtheus, Menœtius, and Atlas. But the offspring of Kronos were the most powerful and transcendent of all. He married his sister Rhea, and had by her three daughters—Hestia, Dêmêtêr, and Hêrê—and three sons, Hadês, Poseidôn, and Zeus, the latter at once the youngest and the greatest.

But Kronos foreboded to himself destruction from one of his own children, and accordingly, as soon as any of them were born, he immediately swallowed them and retained them in his own belly. In this manner had the five first been treated, and Rhea was on the point of being delivered of Zeus. Grieved and indignant at the loss of her children, she applied for counsel to her father and mother, Uranos and Gæa, who aided her to conceal the birth of Zeus. They conveyed her by night to Lyktus in Crête, hid the new-born child in a woody cavern on Mount Ida, and gave to Kronos, in place of it, a stone wrapped in swaddling clothes, which he greedily swallowed,

¹ Hesiod, Theog. 192. This legend respecting the birth of Aphrodítē seems to have been derived partly from her name (*ἀφρός, foam*), partly from the surname Urania, *Αφροδίτη Οὐρανία*, under which she was so very extensively worshipped, especially both in Cyprus and Kythêra, seemingly originated in both islands by the Phœnicians. Herodot. i. 105. Compare the instructive section in Boeckh's Metrologie, c. iv. § 4.

believing it to be his child. Thus was the safety of Zeus ensured.¹ As he grew up his vast powers fully developed themselves: at the suggestion of Gaea, he induced Kronos by stratagem to vomit up, first the stone which had been given to him,—next the five children whom he had previously devoured. Hestia, Dêmêtêr, Hêrê, Poseidôn and Hadês, were thus allowed to grow up along with Zeus; and the stone to which the latter owed his preservation was placed near the temple of Delphi, where it ever afterwards stood, as a conspicuous and venerable memorial to the religious Greek.²

We have not yet exhausted the catalogue of beings generated during this early period, anterior to the birth of Zeus. Nyx, alone and without any partner, gave birth to a numerous progeny: Thanatos, Hypnos and Oñeiroi: Mômus and Oïzys (Grief); Klôthô, Lachesis, and Atropos, the three Fates; the retributive and equalising Nemesis; Apatê and Philotês (Deceit and amorous Propensity), Geras (Old Age) and Eris (Contention). From Eris proceeded an abundant offspring, all mischievous and maleficent: Ponos (Suffering), Lêtê, Limos (Famine), Phonos and Machê (Slaughter and Battle), Dysnomia and Atê (Lawlessness and reckless Impulse) and Horkos, the ever-watchful sanctioner of oaths, as well as the inexorable punisher of voluntary perjury.³

Gaea, too, intermarrying with Pontus, gave birth to Nereus, the just and righteous old man of the sea; to Thaumas, Phorkys and Kêtô. From Nereus, and Doris daughter of Oceanus, proceeded the fifty Nereids or Sea-nymphs. Thaumas also married Elektra daughter of Oceanus, and had by her Iris and the two Harpies, Aellô and Okypetê,—winged and swift as the winds. From Phorkys and Kêtô sprung the Dragon of the Hesperides, and the monstrous Grææ, and Gorgons: the blood of Medusa, one of the Gorgons, when killed by Perseus, produced Chrysaor and the horse Pegasus; Chrysaor and Kallirhoe gave birth to Geryôn as well as to Echidna,—a creature half-nymph and half-serpent, unlike both to gods and to men. Other monsters arose from the union of Echidna with Typhaôn,—Orthros, the two-headed dog of Geryôn; Cerberus the dog of Hadês, with fifty heads, and the Lernæan

¹ Hesiod, Theog. 452, 487. Apollod. i. 1, 6.

² Hesiod, Theog. 498—

Τὸν μὲν Ζεὺς στήριξε κατὰ χθονὸς εύρυοδείης
Πυθοὶ ἐν ἡγαθέῃ, γνάλοις ὑπὸ Παριησοίο.
Σὴμ οὐκέποισα, θανμα θνητοῖσι βροτοῖσι.

³ Hesiod, Theog. 212-232.

Hydra. From the latter proceeded the Chimæra, the Sphinx of Thêbes, and the Nemean lion.¹

A powerful and important progeny, also, was that of Styx, daughter of Oceanus, by Pallas; she had Zélos and Nikê (Imperiousness and Victory), and Kratos and Bia (Strength and Force). The hearty and early co-operation of Styx and her four sons with Zeus was one of the main causes which enabled him to achieve his victory over the Titans.

Zeus had grown up not less distinguished for mental capacity than for bodily force. He and his brothers now determined to wrest the power from the hands of Kronos and the Titans, and a long and desperate struggle commenced, in which all the gods and all the goddesses took part. Zeus convoked them to Olympus, and promised to all who would aid him against Kronos, that their functions and privileges should remain undisturbed. The first who responded to the call, came with her four sons, and embraced his cause, was Styx. Zeus took them all four as his constant attendants, and conferred upon Styx the majestic distinction of being the Horkos, or oath-sanctioner of the Gods,—what Horkos was to men, Styx was to the Gods.²

Still further to strengthen himself, Zeus released the other Uranids who had been imprisoned in Tartarus by their father,—the Cyclôpes and the Centimanes,—and prevailed upon them to take part with him against the Titans. The former supplied him with thunder and lightning, and the latter brought into the fight their boundless muscular strength.³ Ten full years did the combat continue; Zeus and the Kronids occupying Olympus, and the Titans being established on the more southerly mountain-chain of Othrys. All nature was convulsed, and the distant Oceanus, though he took no part in the struggle, felt the boiling, the noise, and the shock, not less than Gæa and Pontus. The thunder of Zeus, combined with the crags and mountains torn up and hurled by the Centimanes, at length prevailed, and the Titans were defeated and thrust down into Tartarus. Iapetos, Kronos, and the remaining Titans (Oceanus excepted) were imprisoned, perpetually and irrevocably, in that subterranean dungeon, a wall of brass being built around them by Poseidôn, and the three Centimanes being planted as guards.

Of the two sons of Iapetos, Mencetius was made to share

¹ Hesiod, Theog. 240-320. Apollodôr. i. 2, 6, 7.

² Hesiod, Theog. 385-403.

³ Hesiod, Theog. 140, 624, 657. Apollodôr. i. 2, 4.

this prison, while Atlas was condemned to stand for ever at the extreme west, and to bear upon his shoulders the solid vault of heaven.¹

Thus were the Titans subdued, and the Kronids with Zeus at their head placed in possession of power. They were not, however, yet quite secure; for Gaea, intermarrying with Tartarus, gave birth to a new and still more formidable monster called Typhoeus, of such tremendous properties and promise, that, had he been allowed to grow into full development, nothing could have prevented him from vanquishing all rivals and becoming supreme. But Zeus foresaw the danger, smote him at once with a thunderbolt from Olympus, and burnt him up: he was cast along with the rest into Tartarus, and no further enemy remained to question the sovereignty of the Kronids.²

With Zeus begins a new dynasty and a different order of beings. Zeus, Poseidon and Hades agree upon the distribution before noticed, of functions and localities: Zeus retaining the *Æther* and the atmosphere, together with the general presiding function; Poseidon obtaining the sea, and administering subterranean forces generally: and Hades ruling the under-world, or region in which the half-animated shadows of departed men reside.

It has been already stated, that in Zeus, his brothers and his sisters, and his and their divine progeny, we find the *present* Gods; that is, those, for the most part, whom the Homeric and Hesiodic Greeks recognised and worshipped. The wives of Zeus were numerous as well as his offspring. First he married Metis, the wisest and most sagacious of the goddesses; but Gaea and Uranos forewarned him that if he permitted himself to have children by her, they would be stronger than himself and dethrone him. Accordingly when Metis was on the point of being delivered of Athene, he swallowed her up, and her wisdom and sagacity thus became permanently identified with his own being.³ His head was subsequently cut open, in

¹ The battle with the Titans, Hesiod, Theog. 627-735. Hesiod mentions nothing about the Gigantes and the Gigantomachia: Apollo-dorus, on the other hand, gives this latter in some detail, but despatches the Titans in a few words (i. 2, 4; i. 6, 1). The Gigantes seem to be only a second edition of the Titans,—a sort of duplication to which the legendary poets were often inclined.

² Hesiod, Theog. 820-869. Apollod. i. 6, 3. He makes Typhon very nearly victorious over Zeus. Typhoeus, according to Hesiod, is father of the irregular, violent, and mischievous winds: Notus, Boreas, Argestes and Zephyrus, are of divine origin (870).

³ Hesiod, Theog. 885-900.

order to make way for the exit and birth of the goddess Athénê.¹ By Themis, Zeus begat the Hôræ; by Eurynomê, the three Charities or Graces: by Mnêmosynê, the Muses; by Lêtô (Latona), Apollo and Artemis; and by Dêmêtêr, Persephonê. Last of all he took for his wife Hêrê, who maintained permanently the dignity of queen of the Gods; by her he had Hêbê, Arê, and Eileithyia. Hermês also was born to him by Maia, the daughter of Atlas; Hêphæstos was born to Hêrê, according to some accounts by Zeus; according to others, by her own unaided generative force.² He was born lame, and Hêrê was ashamed of him; she wished to secrete him away, but he made his escape into the sea, and found shelter under the maternal care of the Nereids Thetis and Eurynomê.³

Our enumeration of the divine race, under the presidency of Zeus, will thus give us,⁴—

1. The twelve great gods and goddesses of Olympus,—Zeus, Poseidôn, Apollo, Arê, Hêphæstos, Hermês, Hêrê, Athénê, Artemis, Aphroditê, Hestia, Dêmêtêr.

2. An indefinite number of other deities, not included among the Olympic, seemingly because the number *twelve* was complete without them, but some of them not inferior in power and dignity to many of the twelve:—Hadês, Hêlios, Hekatê, Dionysos, Lêtô, Diônê, Persephonê, Selénê, Themis, Eôs, Harmonia, the Charities, the Muses, the Eileithyiæ, the Moeræ, the Oceanids and the Nereids, Proteus, Eidothea, the Nymphs, Leukothea, Phorkys, Æolus, Nemesis, &c.

3. Deities who perform special services to the greater gods:—Iris, Hêbê, the Hôræ, &c.

4. Deities whose personality is more faintly and unsteadily conceived:—Atê, the Litæ, Eris, Thanatos, Hypnos, Kratos, Bia, Ossa, &c.⁵ The same name is here employed sometimes to designate the person, sometimes the attribute or event not personified,—an unconscious transition of ideas, which, when consciously performed, is called Allegory.

5. Monsters, offspring of the Gods:—the Harpies, the Gorgons, the Grææ, Pegasus, Chrysaor, Echidna, Chimæra, the Dragon of the Hesperides, Cerberus, Orthros, Geryôn, the Lernæan Hydra, the Nemean lion, Scylla and Charybdis, the Centaurs, the Sphinx, Xanthos and Balios the immortal horses, &c.

¹ Apollod. i. 3, 6.

² Hesiod, Theog. 900-944.

³ Homer, Iliad, xviii. 397.

⁴ See Burckhardt, Homer. und Hesiod. Mythologie, sect. 102. (Leipz. 1844.)

⁵ Λιψός—*Hunger*—is a person, in Hesiod, Opp. Di. 299.

From the gods we slide down insensibly, first to heroes, and then to men ; but before we proceed to this new mixture, it is necessary to say a few words on the theogony generally. I have given it briefly as it stands in the Hesiodic Theogonia, because that poem—in spite of great incoherence and confusion, arising seemingly from diversity of authorship as well as diversity of age—presents an ancient and genuine attempt to cast the divine foretime into a systematic sequence. Homer and Hesiod were the grand authorities in the Pagan world respecting theogony. But in the Iliad and Odyssey nothing is found except passing allusions and implications ; and even in the Hymns (which were commonly believed in antiquity to be the productions of the same author as the Iliad and the Odyssey) there are only isolated, unconnected narratives. Accordingly men habitually took their information respecting their theogonic antiquities from the Hesiodic poem, where it was ready laid out before them ; and the legends consecrated in that work acquired both an extent of circulation and a firm hold on the national faith, such as independent legends could seldom or never rival. Moreover the scrupulous and sceptical Pagans, as well as the open assailants of Paganism in later times, derived their subjects of attack from the same source ; so that it has been absolutely necessary to recount in their naked simplicity the Hesiodic stories, in order to know what it was that Plato deprecated and Xenophanès denounced. The strange proceedings ascribed to Uranos, Kronos and Zeus, have been more frequently alluded to, in the way of ridicule or condemnation than any other portion of the mythical world.

But though the Hesiodic theogony passed as orthodox among the later Pagans,¹ because it stood before them as the only system anciently set forth and easily accessible, it was evidently not the only system received at the date of the poem itself. Homer knows nothing of Uranos, in the sense of an arch-God anterior to Kronos. Uranos and Gæa, like Oceanus, Tethys and Nyx, are with him great and venerable Gods, but neither the one nor the other present the character of predecessors of Kronos and Zeus.² The Cyclôpes, whom Hesiod ranks as sons of Uranos and fabricators of thunder, are in

¹ See Göttling, *Præfat. ad Hesiod. p. 23.*

² Iliad, xiv. 249 ; xix. 259. Odyss. v. 184. Oceanus and Tethys seem to be presented in the Iliad as the primitive Father and Mother of the Gods—

Homer neither one nor the other : they are not noticed in the *Iliad* at all, and in the *Odyssey* they are gross gigantic shepherds and cannibals, having nothing in common with the Hesiodic *Cyclōps* except the one round central eye.¹ Of the three Centimanes enumerated by Hesiod, Briareus only is mentioned in Homer, and, to all appearance, not as the son of *Uranos*, but as the son of *Poseidōn* ; not as aiding *Zeus* in his combat against the *Titans*, but as rescuing him at a critical moment from a conspiracy formed against him by *Hérē*, *Poseidōn*, and *Athénē*.² Not only is the Hesiodic *Uranos* (with the *Uranids*) omitted in Homer, but the relations between *Zeus* and *Kronos* are also presented in a very different light. No mention is made of *Kronos* swallowing his young children : on the contrary, *Zeus* is the eldest of the three brothers, instead of the youngest, and the children of *Kronos* live with him and *Rhea* : there the stolen intercourse between *Zeus* and *Hérē* first takes place without the knowledge of their parents.³ When *Zeus* puts *Kronos* down into *Tartarus*, *Rhea* consigns her daughter *Hérē* to the care of *Oceanus* : no notice do we find of any terrific battle with the *Titans* as accompanying that event. *Kronos*, *Iapetos*, and the remaining *Titans* are down in *Tartarus*, in the lowest depths under the earth, far removed from the genial rays of *Hēlios* ; but they are still powerful and venerable, and *Hypnos* makes *Hérē* swear an oath in their name, as the most inviolable that he can think of.⁴

In Homer, then, we find nothing beyond the simple fact that *Zeus* thrust his father *Kronos*, together with the remaining *Titans*, into *Tartarus* ; an event to which he affords us a tolerable parallel in certain occurrences even under the presidency of *Zeus* himself. For the other gods make more than one rebellious attempt against *Zeus*, and are only put down, partly by his unparalleled strength, partly by the presence of his ally the Centimane *Briareus*. *Kronos*, like *Laértes* or *Pēleus*, has become old, and has been supplanted by a force vastly superior to his own. The Homeric epic treats *Zeus* as present, and like all the interesting heroic characters, a father must be assigned to him : that father has once been the chief of the *Titans*, but has been superseded and put down into *Tartarus*.

¹ *Odys. ix. 87.*

² *Iliad. i. 401.*

³ *Iliad. xiv. 203-295 ; xv. 204.*

⁴ *Iliad. vii. 482 ; xiv. 274-279.* In the Hesiodic *Opp. et Di.*, *Kronos* is represented as ruling in the Islands of the Blest in the neighbourhood of *Oceanus* (v. 168).

along with the latter, so soon as Zeus and the superior breed of the Olympic gods acquired their full development.

That antithesis between Zeus and Kronos—between the Olympic gods and the Titans—which Homer has thus briefly brought to view, Hesiod has amplified into a theogony, with many things new, and some things contradictory to his predecessor; while Eumēlus or Arktinus in the poem called *Titanomachia* (now lost) also adopted it as their special subject.¹ As Stasinus, Arktinus, Leschēs, and others, enlarged the Legend of Troy by composing poems relating to a supposed time anterior to the commencement, or subsequent to the termination of the *Iliad*,—as other poets recounted adventures of Odysseus subsequent to his landing in Ithaka,—so Hesiod enlarged and systematised, at the same time that he corrupted, the skeleton theogony which we find briefly indicated in Homer. There is violence and rudeness in the Homeric gods, but the great genius of Grecian Epic is no way accountable for the stories of Uranos and Kronos,—the standing reproach against Pagan legendary narrative.

How far these stories are the invention of Hesiod himself is impossible to determine.² They bring us down to a cast of

¹ See the few fragments of the *Titanomachia*, in Dūntzer, *Epic. Græc. Fragm.* p. 2; and Heyne, ad *Apollodōr.* i. 2. Perhaps there was more than one poem on the subject, though it seems that *Athenæus* had only read one (viii. p. 277).

In the *Titanomachia*, the generations anterior to Zeus were still further lengthened by making Uranos son of *Æthér* (Fr. 4 Dūntzer). *Ægeon* was also represented as son of *Pontos* and *Gæa*, and as having fought in the ranks of the Titans: in the *Iliad* he (the same who is called *Briareus*) is the fast ally of Zeus.

A *Titanographia* was ascribed to *Musæus* (Schol. *Apollon. Rhod.* iii. 1178; compare *Lactant. de Fals. Rel.* i. 21).

² That the Hesiodic Theogony is referable to an age considerably later than the Homeric poems, appears now to be the generally admitted opinion; and the reasons for believing so are, in my opinion, satisfactory. Whether the Theogony is composed by the same author as the *Works and Days* is a disputed point. The Boeotian literati in the days of *Pausanias* decidedly denied the identity, and ascribed to their Hesiod only the *Works and Days*: *Pausanias* himself concurs with them (ix. 31, 4; ix. 35, 1), and *Völcker* (*Mythologie des Japetisch. Geschlechts*, p. 14) maintains the same opinion, as well as *Göttling* (*Præf. ad Hesiod. xxi.*): *K. O. Müller* (*History of Grecian Literature*, ch. 8, § 4) thinks that there is not sufficient evidence to form a decisive opinion.

Under the name of Hesiod (in that vague language which is usual in antiquity respecting authorship, but which modern critics have not much mended by speaking of the Hesiodic school, sect, or family) passed many different poems, belonging to three classes quite distinct from each other, but all disparate from the Homeric epic:—1. The poems of legend cast into historical and genealogical series, such as the *Eoiai*, the *Catalogue of*

fancy more coarse and indelicate than the Homeric, and more nearly resembling some of the Holy Chapters (*ἱεροὶ λόγοι*) of the more recent mysteries, such (for example) as the tale of Dionysos Zagreus. There is evidence in the Theogony itself that the author was acquainted with local legends current both at Krête and at Delphi; for he mentions both the mountain-cave in Krête wherein the new-born Zeus was hidden, and the stone near the Delphian temple—the identical stone which Kronos had swallowed—“placed by Zeus himself as a sign and wonder to mortal men.” Both these two monuments, which the poet expressly refers to, and had probably seen,

Women, &c. 2. The poems of a didactic or ethical tendency, such as the Works and Days, the Precepts of Cheirōn, the Art of Augural Prophecy, &c. 3. Separate and short mythical compositions, such as the Shield of Hēraklēs, the marriage of Keyx (which, however, was of disputed authenticity, Athenæ. ii. p. 49), the Epithalamium of Pēleus and Thetis, &c. (See Marktscheffel, Praefat. ad Fragment. Hesiod. p. 89.)

The Theogony belongs chiefly to the first of these classes, but it has also a dash of the second in the legend of Promētheus, &c.; moreover in the portion which respects Hekatē, it has both a mystic character and a distinct bearing upon present life and customs, which we may also trace in the allusions to Krête and Delphi. There seems reason to place it in the same age with the Works and Days, perhaps in the half century preceding 700 B.C., and little, if at all, anterior to Archilochus. The poem is evidently conceived upon one scheme, yet the parts are so disorderly and incoherent, that it is difficult to say how much is interpolation. Hermann has well dissected the exordium: see the preface to Gaisford's Hesiod (*Poëtae Minor.* p. 63).

K. O. Müller tells us (*ut sup.* p. 90) “The Titans, according to the notions of Hesiod, represent a system of things in which elementary beings, natural powers, and notions of order and regularity are united to form a whole. The Cyclōpes denote the transient disturbances of this order of nature by storms, and the Hekatoncheires, or hundred-handed Giants, signify the fearful power of the greater revolutions of nature.” The poem affords little presumption that any such ideas were present to the mind of its author, as, I think, will be seen if we read 140–155, 630–745.

The Titans, the Cyclōpes, and the Hekatoncheires, can no more be construed into physical phænomena than Chrysaor, Pegasus, Echidna, the Grææ, or the Gorgons. Zeus, like Hēraklēs, or Jasōn, or Perseus, if his adventures are to be described, must have enemies, worthy of himself and his vast type, and whom it is some credit for him to overthrow. Those who contend with him or assist him must be conceived on a scale fit to be drawn on the same imposing canvas: the dwarfish proportions of man will not satisfy the sentiment of the poet or his audience respecting the grandeur and glory of the gods. To obtain creations of adequate sublimity for such an object, the poet may occasionally borrow analogies from the striking accidents of physical nature, and when such an allusion manifests itself clearly, the critic does well to point it out. But it seems to me a mistake to treat these approximations to physical phænomena as forming the *main scheme* of the poet,—to look for them everywhere, and to presume them where there is little or no indication.

imply a whole train of accessory and explanatory local legends—current probably among the priests of Krête and Delphi, between which places, in ancient times, there was an intimate religious connexion. And we may trace further in the poem—that which would be the natural feeling of Krêtan worshippers of Zeus—an effort to make out that Zeus was justified in his aggression on Kronos, by the conduct of Kronos himself both towards his father and towards his children: the treatment of Kronos by Zeus appears in Hesiod as the retribution foretold and threatened by the mutilated Uranos against the son who had outraged him. In fact, the relations of Uranos and Gaea are in almost all their particulars a mere copy and duplication of those between Kronos and Rhea, differing only in the mode whereby the final catastrophe is brought about. Now castration was a practice thoroughly abhorrent both to the feelings and to the customs of Greece;¹ but it was seen with melancholy frequency in the domestic life as well as in the religious worship of Phrygia and other parts of Asia; and it even became the special qualification of a priest of the Great Mother Cybelê,² as well as of the Ephesian Artemis. The employment of the sickle ascribed to Kronos seems to be the product of an imagination familiar with the Asiatic worship and legends, which were connected with and partially resembled the Krêtan.³ And this deduction becomes the more probable when we connect it with the first genesis of iron, which Hesiod mentions to have been produced for the express purpose of fabricating

¹ The strongest evidences of this feeling are exhibited in Herodotus, iii. 48; viii. 105. See an example of this mutilation inflicted upon a youth named Adamas by the Thracian king Kotys, in Aristot. Polit. v. 8, 12, and the tale about the Corinthian Periander, Herod. iii. 48.

It is an instance of the habit, so frequent among the Attic tragedians, of ascribing Asiatic or Phrygian manners to the Trojans, when Sophocles, in his lost play *Troilus* (ap. Jul. Poll. x. 165), introduced one of the characters of his drama as having been castrated by order of Hecuba, Σκαλυῆ γὰρ ὅρχεις βασιλεὺς ἐκτέμουστ' ἔμούς,—probably the Παιδαγωγὸς or guardian and companion of the youthful Troilus. See Welcker, Griechisch. Tragöd. vol. i. p. 125.

² Herodot. vii. 105, εὐνοῦχοι. Lucian, *De Deâ Syriâ*, c. 50. Strabo, xiv. pp. 640–641.

³ Diodor. v. 64. Strabo, x. p. 469. Hoeckh, in his learned work *Krête* (vol. i. books 1 and 2), has collected all the information attainable respecting the early influences of Phrygia and Asia Minor upon Krête: nothing seems ascertainable except the general fact; all the particular evidences are lamentably vague.

The worship of the Diktæan Zeus seems to have originally belonged to the Eteokrêtes, who were not Hellenes, and were more akin to the Asiatic population than to the Hellenic. Strabo, x. p. 478. Hoeckh, *Krête*, vol. i. p. 139.

the fatal sickle; for metallurgy finds a place in the early legends both of the Trojan and of the Krêtan Ida, and the three Idaean Dactyls, the legendary inventors of it, are assigned sometimes to one and sometimes to the other.¹

As Hesiod had extended the Homeric series of gods by prefixing the dynasty of Uranos to that of Kronos, so the Orphic theogony lengthened it still further.² First came Chronos, or Time, as a person, after him *Æthér* and Chaos, out of whom Chronos produced the vast mundane egg. Hence emerged in process of time the first-born god Phanēs, or Mētis, or Hērikapæos, a person of double sex, who first generated the Kosmos, or mundane system, and who carried within him the seed of the gods. He gave birth to Nyx, by whom he begat Uranos and Gæa; as well as to Hēlios and Selēnē.³

From Uranos and Gæa sprang the three Mceræ, or Fates, the three Centimanes, and the three Cyclōpes: these latter were cast by Uranos into Tartarus, under the foreboding that they would rob him of his dominion. In revenge for this maltreatment of her sons, Gæa produced of herself the fourteen Titans, seven male and seven female: the former were Kœos, Krios, Phorkys, Kronos, Oceanus, Hyperiōn, and Iapetos; the latter were Themis, Tēthys, Mnēmosynē, Theia, Diônē, Phœbē, and Rhea.⁴ They received the name of Titans because they avenged upon Uranos the expulsion of their elder brothers. Six of the Titans, headed by Kronos, the most powerful of them all, conspiring against Uranos, castrated and dethroned him: Oceanus alone

¹ Hesiod, Theogon. 161—

Ἄγα δὲ ποιήσασα γένος πολιοῦ ἀδάμαντος,
Τεῦχε μέγα δρέπανον, &c.

See the extract from the old poem *Phorōnis* ap. Schol. Apoll. Rhod. 1129; and Strabo, x. p. 472.

² See the scanty fragments of the Orphic theogony in Hermann's edition of the *Orphica*, pp. 448, 504, which it is difficult to understand and piece together, even with the aid of Lobeck's elaborate examination (*Aglaophamus*, p. 470, &c.). The passages are chiefly preserved by Proclus and the later Platonists, who seem to entangle them almost inextricably with their own philosophical ideas.

The first few lines of the Orphic *Argonautica* contain a brief summary of the chief points of the Theogony.

³ See Lobeck, *Aglaoph.* p. 472-476, 490-500, Μῆτιν σπέρμα φέροντα θεῶν κλυτὸν Ἡρικεπαῖον; again, Θῆλυς καὶ γενέτωρ κρατερὸς θεὸς Ἡρικεπαῖος. Compare Lactant. iv. 8, 4; Suidas, v. Φάνης: Athenagoras, xx. 296; Diodor. i. 27.

This egg figures, as might be expected, in the cosmogony set forth by the Birds, Aristophan. Av. 695. Nyx gives birth to an egg, out of which steps the golden Erōs; from Erōs and Chaos spring the race of birds.

⁴ Lobeck, *Ag.* p. 504. Athenagor. xv. p. 64.

stood aloof and took no part in the aggression. Kronos assumed the government, and fixed his seat on Olympus ; while Oceanus remained apart, master of his own divine stream.¹ The reign of Kronos was a period of tranquillity and happiness, as well as of extraordinary longevity and vigour.

Kronos and Rhea gave birth to Zeus and his brothers and sisters. The concealment and escape of the infant Zeus, and the swallowing of the stone by Kronos, are given in the Orphic Theogony substantially in the same manner as by Hesiod, only in a style less simple and more mysticised. Zeus is concealed in the cave of Nyx, the seat of Phanēs himself, along with Eidē and Adrasteia, who nurse and preserve him, while the armed dance and sonorous instruments of the Kurêtēs prevent his infant cries from reaching the ears of Kronos. When grown up, he lays a snare for his father, intoxicates him with honey, and, having surprised him in the depth of sleep, enchains and castrates him.² Thus exalted to the supreme mastery, he swallowed and absorbed into himself Mêtis, or Phanēs, with all the pre-existing elements of things, and then generated all things anew out of his own being and conformably to his own divine ideas.³ So scanty are the remains of this system, that we find it difficult to trace individually the gods and goddesses sprung from Zeus beyond Apollo, Dionysos, and Persephonê—the latter being confounded with Artemis and Hekatê.

¹ Lobeck, Ag. p. 507. Plato, Timaeus, p. 41. In the *Διονύσου τροφοὶ* of Æschylus, the old attendants of the god Dionysos were said to have been cut up and boiled in a caldron, and rendered again young, by Medeia. Pherecydēs and Simonidēs said that Jasōn himself had been so dealt with. Schol. Aristoph. Equit. 1321.

² Lobeck, p. 514. Porphyry, de Antro Nympharum, c. 16, φησὶ γὰρ παρ' Ὀρφεῖ η̄ Νὺξ, τῷ Διτ̄ ὑποιθεμένη τὸν διὰ τοῦ μέλιτος δόλον,

Ἐντ̄ ἀν̄ δὴ μιν̄ ἰδηι ὑπὸ δρυσὶν̄ ὑψικόμοισι
*Ἐργοῖσιν μεθύνοντα μελισσάν̄ ἐριβομβων̄,
Αὐτίκα μιν̄ δῆσον̄.

*Ο καὶ πάσχει ὁ Κρόνος καὶ δεθεὶς ἐκτέμνεται, ὡς Οὐρανός.

Compare Timaeus ap. Schol. Apoll. Rhod. iv. 983.

³ The Catopsis of Phanēs by Zeus is one of the most memorable points of the Orphic Theogony. Lobeck, p. 519; also Fragm. vi. p. 456 of Hermann's *Orphica*.

From this absorption and subsequent reproduction of all things by Zeus, flowed the magnificent string of Orphic predicates about him—

Ζεὺς ἀρχὴ, Ζεὺς μέσσα, Διὸς δὲ πάντα τέτυκται,—

an allusion to which is traceable even in Plato, de Legg. iv. p. 715. Plutarch, de Defectu Oracul. t. ix. p. 379, c. 48. Diodōrus (i. 11) is the most ancient writer remaining to us who mentions the name of Phanēs, in a line cited as proceeding from Orpheus ; wherein, however, Phanēs is identified with Dionysos. Compare Macrobius, Saturnal. i. 18.

But there is one new personage begotten by Zeus, who stands pre-eminently marked in the Orphic Theogony, and whose adventures constitute one of its peculiar features. Zagreus, "the horned child," is the son of Zeus by his own daughter Persephonê: he is the favourite of his father, a child of magnificent promise, and predestined, if he grow up, to succeed to supreme dominion, as well as to the handling of the thunderbolt. He is seated, whilst an infant, on the throne beside Zeus, guarded by Apollo and the Kurêtês. But the jealous Hérê intercepts his career, and incites the Titans against him, who, having first smeared their faces with plaster, approach him on the throne, tempt his childish fancy with playthings, and kill him with a sword while he is contemplating his face in a mirror. They then cut up his body and boil it in a caldron, leaving only the heart, which is picked up by Athénê and carried to Zeus, who in his wrath strikes down the Titans with thunder into Tartarus; whilst Apollo is directed to collect the remains of Zagreus and bury them at the foot of Mount Parnassus. The heart is given to Semelê, and Zagreus is born again from her under the form of Dionysos.¹

¹ About the tale of Zagreus, see Lobeck, p. 552 *sqq.* Nonnus in his *Dionysiaca* has given many details about it:—

Ζαγρέα γενναμένη κερόεν βρέφος, &c. (vi. 264.)

Clemens Alexandrin. Admonit. ad Gent. p. 11, 12, Sylb. The story was treated both by Kallimachus and by Euphorion, *Etymolog. Magn.* v. *Ζαγρέως*, Schol. Lycophr. 208. In the old epic poem Alkmæônis or Epigoni, Zagreus is a surname of Hadês. See *Fragment. 4*, p. 7, ed. Duntzer. Respecting the Orphic Theogony generally, Brandis (*Handbuch der Geschichte der Griechisch-Römisch. Philosophie*, c. xvii., xviii.), K. O. Müller (*Prolegg. Mythol.* pp. 379-396), and Zoega (*Abhandlungen*, v. pp. 211-263) may be consulted with much advantage. Brandis regards this Theogony as *considerably older* than the first Ionic philosophy, which is a higher antiquity than appears probable: some of the ideas which it contains, such, for example, as that of the Orphic egg, indicate a departure from the string of purely personal generations which both Homer and Hesiod exclusively recount, and a resort to something like physical analogies. On the whole, we cannot reasonably claim for it more than half a century above the age of Onomakritus. The Theogony of Pherekydês of Syros seems to have borne some analogy to the Orphic. See Diogen. Laërt. i. 119, Sturz. *Fragment. Pherekyd. § 5-6*, Brandis, *Handbuch, ut sup. c. xxii.* Pherekydês partially deviated from the mythical track or personal successions set forth by Hesiod. *ἐπειδὴ γε μεμιγμένοι αὐτῶν καὶ τῷ μὴ μυθικῷ ἀπαντα λέγειν, οἷον Φερεκύδης καὶ ἔτεροι τινες, &c.* (Aristot. *Metaphys.* N. p. 301, ed. Brandis.) Porphyrius, de *Antro Nymphar.* c. 31, *καὶ τοῦ Συρίου Φερεκύδου μυχὸς καὶ βόθρος καὶ ἄντρα καὶ θύρας καὶ πύλας λέγοντος, καὶ διὰ τούτων αἰνιττομένου τὰς τῶν ψυχῶν γενέσεις καὶ ἀπογενέσεις, &c.* Eudêmus the Peripatetic, pupil of Aristotle, had drawn up an account of the Orphic Theogony as well as of the doctrines of Pherekydês, Akusilaus and others, which was still in the hands of the

Such is the tissue of violent fancies comprehended under the title of the Orphic Theogony, and read as such, it appears, by Plato, Isokratēs, and Aristotle. It will be seen that it is based upon the Hesiodic Theogony, but, according to the general expansive tendency of Grecian legend, much new matter is added: Zeus has in Homer one predecessor, in Hesiod two, and in Orpheus four.

The Hesiodic Theogony, though later in date than the Iliad and Odyssey, was coeval with the earliest period of what may be called Grecian history, and certainly of an age earlier than 700 B.C. It appears to have been widely circulated in Greece, and being at once ancient and short, the general public consulted it as their principal source of information respecting divine antiquity. The Orphic Theogony belongs to a later date, and contains the Hesiodic ideas and persons, enlarged and mystically disguised. Its vein of invention was less popular, adapted more to the contemplation of a sect specially prepared than to the taste of a casual audience. And it appears accordingly to have obtained currency chiefly among purely speculative men.¹ Among the majority of these latter, however, it acquired greater veneration, and above all was supposed to be of greater antiquity than the Hesiodic. The belief in its superior antiquity (disallowed by Herodotus, and seemingly also by Aristotle²), as well as the respect for its

Platonists of the fourth century, though it is now lost. The extracts which we find seem all to countenance the belief that the Hesiodic Theogony formed the basis upon which they worked. See about Akusilaus, Plato, *Sympos.* p. 178; Clem. Alex. *Strom.* p. 629.

¹ The Orphic Theogony is never cited in the ample Scholia on Homer, though Hesiod is often alluded to. (See Lobeck, *Aglaoph.* p. 540.) Nor can it have been present to the minds of Xenophanes and Herakleitus, as representing any widely diffused Grecian belief: the former, who so severely condemned Homer and Hesiod, would have found Orpheus much more deserving of his censure: and the latter could hardly have omitted Orpheus from his memorable denunciation:—Πολυμαθήν νόον οὐ διδάσκει. 'Ησίοδον γὰρ ἀν εὖδαξε καὶ Πιθαγόραν, αὐτίς δὲ Εενοφάνεδ τε καὶ Ἐκαταῖον. Diog. Laër. ix. i. Isokratēs treats Orpheus as the most censorious of all the poets. See Busiris, p. 229; ii. p. 309, Bekk. The Theogony of Orpheus, as conceived by Apollonius Rhodius (i. 504) in the third century B.C., and by Nigidius in the first century B.C. (Servius ad Virgil. *Eclog.* iv. 10), seems to have been on a more contracted scale than that which is given in the text. But neither of them notice the tale of Zagreus, which we know to be as old as Onomakritus.

² This opinion of Herodotus is implied in the remarkable passage about Homer and Hesiod, ii. 53, though he never once names Orpheus—only alluding once to "Orphic ceremonies," ii. 81. He speaks more than once of the prophecies of Musæus. Aristotle denied the past existence and reality of Orpheus. See Cicero *de Nat. Deor.* i. 38.

contents, increased during the Alexandrine age and through the declining centuries of Paganism, reaching its maximum among the New-Platonists of the third and fourth century after Christ. Both the Christian assailants, as well as the defenders of Paganism, treated it as the most ancient and venerable summary of the Grecian faith. Orpheus is celebrated by Pindar as the harper and companion of the Argonautic maritime heroes: Orpheus and Musæus, as well as Pamphos and Olên, the great supposed authors of theogonic, mystical, oracular, and prophetic verses and hymns, were generally considered by literary Greeks as older than either Hesiod or Homer.¹ And such was also the common opinion of modern scholars until a period comparatively recent. But it has now been shown, on sufficient ground, that the compositions which passed under these names emanate for the most part from poets of the Alexandrine age, and subsequent to the Christian æra; and that even the earliest among them, which served as the stock on which the later additions were engrafted, belong to a period far more recent than Hesiod; probably to the century preceding Onomakritus (B.C. 610-510). It seems, however, certain that both Orpheus and Musæus were names of established reputation at the time when Onomakritus flourished; and it is distinctly stated by Pausanias that the latter was himself the author of the most remarkable and characteristic mythe of the Orphic Theogony—the discription of Zagreus by the Titans, and his resurrection as Dionysos.²

The names of Orpheus and Musæus (as well as that of

¹ Pindar, Pyth. iv. 177. Plato seems to consider Orpheus as more ancient than Homer. Compare Theatêt. p. 179; Cratylus, p. 402; De Republ. ii. p. 364. The order in which Aristophanês (and Hippias of Elis, ap. Clem. Alex. Str. vi. p. 624) mentions them indicates the same view, Ranæ, 1030. It is unnecessary to cite the later chronologers, among whom the belief in the antiquity of Orpheus was universal; he was commonly described as son of the Muse Calliopê. Androtiôn seems to have denied that he was a Thracian, regarding the Thracians as incurably stupid and illiterate. Androtiôn, Fragm. 36, ed. Didot. Ephorus treated him as having been a pupil of the Idæan Dactyls of Phrygia (see Diodôr. v. 64), and as having learnt from them his τελετὰς and μυστήρια, which he was the first to introduce into Greece. The earliest mention which we find of Orpheus, is that of the poet Ibycus (about B.C. 530), ὄνομάκλυτον Ὀρφῆν. Ibyci Fragm. 9, p. 341, ed. Schneidewin.

² Pausan. viii. 37, 3. Τιτᾶνας δὲ πρῶτοι ἐποίησιν ἐσήγαγεν Ὁμηρος, θεοὺς εἶναι σφᾶς ὑπὸ τῷ καλούμενῷ Ταρτάρῳ· καὶ ἐστὶν ἐν Ἡρας δρκῷ τὰ ἔπη· παρὰ δὲ Ὁμηρος Ὄνομάκριτος, παραλαβὼν τῶν Τιτάνων τὸ δνομα, Διονύσῳ τε συνέθηκεν ὄργια, καὶ εἶναι τοὺς Τιτάνας τῷ Διονύσῳ τὸν παθημάτων ἐποίησεν αὐτονύργος. Both the date, the character, and the function of Onomakritus are distinctly marked by Herodotus, vii. 6.

Pythagoras,¹ looking at one side of his character) represent facts of importance in the history of the Grecian mind—the gradual influx of Thracian, Phrygian, and Egyptian religious ceremonies and feelings, and the increasing diffusion of special mysteries,² schemes for religious purification, and orgies (I venture to anglicise the Greek word, which contains in its original meaning no implication of the ideas of excess to which it was afterwards diverted), in honour of some particular god—distinct both from the public solemnities and from the gentile solemnities of primitive Greece,—celebrated apart from the citizens generally, and approachable only through a certain course of preparation and initiation—sometimes even forbidden to be talked of in the presence of the uninitiated, under the severest threats of divine judgement. Occasionally such voluntary combinations assumed the form of permanent brotherhoods, bound together by periodical solemnities as well as by vows of an ascetic character. Thus the Orphic life (as it was called), or regulation of the Orphic brotherhood, among other injunctions, partly arbitrary and partly abstinent, forbade animal food universally, and, on certain occasions, the use of woollen clothing.³ The great religious and political fraternity of the Pythagoreans, which acted so powerfully on the condition of the Italian cities, was one of the many manifestations of this general tendency, which stands in striking contrast with the

¹ Herodotus believed in the derivation both of the Orphic and Pythagorean regulations from Egypt—διμολογέουσι δὲ ταῦτα τοῖσι Ὀρφικοῖσι καλεομένοισι καὶ Βακχικοῖσι, ἔοντι δὲ Αἰγυπτίοισι (ii. 81). He knows the names of those Greeks who have borrowed from Egypt the doctrine of the metempsychosis, but he will not mention them (ii. 123): he can hardly allude to any one but the Pythagoreans, many of whom he probably knew in Italy. See the curious extract from Xenophanēs respecting the doctrine of Pythagoras, Diogen. Laërt. viii. 37: and the quotation from the Silli of Timōn, Πυθαγόραν δὲ γάγητος ἀποκλίναντ' ἐπὶ δέξαν, &c. Compare Porphy. in Vit. Pythag. c. 41.

² Aristophan. Ran. 1030—

‘Ορφεὺς μὲν γάρ τελεάς θ’ ἡμῖν κατέδειξε, φόνων τ’ ἀπέχεσθαι·
Μουσαῖος τ’, ἔσκετεις τε νόσων καὶ χρησμῶν· Ἡσίοδος δὲ,
Γῆς ἔργασίας, καρπῶν ὥρας, ἀρότους· ο δὲ θεῖος Ὄμηρος
‘Απὸ τοῦ τιμῆν καὶ κλέος ἔσχεν, πλὴν τοῦθ’, ὅτι χρῆστ’ ἐδίδασκεν,
‘Αρετὰς, τάξεις, ὅπλιστεις ἀνδρῶν, &c.

The same general contrast is to be found in Plato, Protagoras, p. 316; the opinion of Pausanias, ix. 30, 4. The poems of Musæus seem to have borne considerable analogy to the Melampodia ascribed to Hesiod (see Clemen. Alex. Str. vi. p. 628); and healing charms are ascribed to Orpheus as well as to Museus. See Eurip. Alcestis, 986.

³ Herod. ii. 81; Euripid. Hippol. 957, and the curious fragment of the lost Κρῆτες of Euripides. Ὀρφικοὶ βίοι, Plato, Legg. vii. 782.

simple, open-hearted, and demonstrative worship of the Homeric Greeks.

Festivals at seed-time and harvest—at the vintage and at the opening of the new wine—were doubtless coeval with the earliest habits of the Greeks; the latter being a period of unusual joviality. Yet in the Homeric poems, Dionysos and Dêmêtêr, the patrons of the vineyard and the cornfield, are seldom mentioned, and decidedly occupy little place in the imagination of the poet as compared with the other gods: nor are they of any conspicuous importance even in the Hesiodic Theogony. But during the interval between Hesiod and Onomakritus, the revolution in the religious mind of Greece was such as to place both these deities in the front rank. According to the Orphic doctrine, Zagreus, son of Persephonê, is destined to be the successor of Zeus; and although the violence of the Titans intercepts this lot, yet even when he rises again from his discription under the name of Dionysos, he is the colleague and co-equal of his divine father.

This remarkable change, occurring as it did during the sixth and a part of the seventh century before the Christian æra, may be traced to the influence of communication with Egypt (which only became fully open to the Greeks about B.C. 660), as well as with Thrace, Phrygia, and Lydia. From hence new religious ideas and feelings were introduced, which chiefly attached themselves to the characters of Dionysos and Dêmêtêr. The Greeks identified these two deities with the great Egyptian Osiris and Isis, so that what was borrowed from the Egyptian worship of the two latter naturally fell to their equivalents in the Grecian system.¹ Moreover the worship of Dionysos (under what name cannot be certainly made out) was indigenous in Thrace,² as that of the Great Mother was in Phrygia, and in Lydia—together with those violent ecstasies and manifestations of temporary frenzy, and that clashing of noisy instruments which we find afterwards characterising it in Greece. The great masters of the pipe—as well as the dithyramb,³ and

¹ Herodot. ii. 42, 59, 144.

² Herodot. v. 7, vii. 111; Euripid. Hecub. 1249, and Rhêsus, 969, and the Prologue to the Bacchæ; Strabo, x. p. 470; Schol. ad Aristophan. Aves, 874; Eustath. ad Dionys. Perieg. 1069; Harpokrat. v. Σάβοι; Photius, Εἴδοι Σαβοῖ. The "Lydiaca" of Th. Menke (Berlin, 1843) traces the early connexion between the religion of Dionysos and that of Cybelê, c. 6, 7. Hoeckh's Krêta (vol. i. p. 128-134) is instructive respecting the Phrygian religion.

³ Aristotle, Polit. viii. 7, 9. Πᾶσα γὰρ Βακχεῖα καὶ πᾶσα ἡ τοιαύτη κίνησις μάλιστα τῶν δργύδων ἔστιν ἐν τοῖς αὐλοῖς· τῶν δὲ ἀρμονιῶν ἐν τοῖς

indeed the whole musical system appropriated to the worship of Dionysos, which contrasted so pointedly with the quiet solemnity of the Pæan addressed to Apollo—were all originally Phrygian.

From all these various countries, novelties, unknown to the Homeric men, found their way into the Grecian worship: and there is one amongst them which deserves to be specially noticed, because it marks the generation of the new class of ideas in their theology. Homer mentions many persons guilty of private or involuntary homicide, and compelled either to go into exile or to make pecuniary satisfaction; but he never once describes any of them to have either received or required purification for the crime.¹ Now in the times subsequent to Homer, purification for homicide comes to be considered as indispensable: the guilty person is regarded as unfit for the society of man or the worship of the gods until he has received it, and special ceremonies are prescribed whereby it is to be administered. Herodotus tells us that the ceremony of purification was the same among the Lydians and among the Greeks: we know that it formed no part of the early religion of the

Φρυγιστὶ μέλεσι λαμβάνει ταῦτα τὸ πρέπον, οἷον δὲ διθύραμβος δοκεῖ δμολογουμένως εἶναι Φρύγιον. Eurip. Bacch. 58—

Ἄρεσθε τάπιχώρι' ἐν πόλει Φρυγῶν
Τυμπανα, 'Ρέας τε μητρὸς ἐμά θ' εὐρήματα, &c.

Plutarch, *Ei* in Delph. c. 9; Philochor. Fr. 21, ed. Didot, p. 389. The complete and intimate manner in which Euripidēs identifies the Bacchic rites of Dionysos with the Phrygian ceremonies in honour of the Great Mother is very remarkable. The fine description given by Lucretius (ii. 600–640) of the Phrygian worship is much enfeebled by his unsatisfactory allegorising.

¹ Schol. ad Iliad. xi. 690—οὐ διὰ τὰ καθάρσια Ἰφίτου πορθεῖται ἡ Πύλος, ἐπεὶ τοι 'Οδυσσεὺς μείζων Νέστορος, καὶ παρ 'Ομήρῳ οὐκ οἰδαμεν φονέα καθαρόμενον, ἀλλ' ἀντιτίνοντα ἡ φυγαδευθμένον. The examples are numerous, and are found both in the Iliad and the Odyssey. Iliad, ii. 665 (*Tlēpolemos*); xiii. 697 (*Meidōn*); xiii. 574 (*Epeigeus*); xxiii. 89 (*Patroklos*); Odyss. xv. 224 (*Theoklymenos*); xiv. 380 (an *Etolian*). Nor does the interesting myth respecting the functions of Atē and the Litæ harmonise with the subsequent doctrine about the necessity of purification. (Iliad, ix. 498.)

2 Herodot. i. 35—ξστι δὲ παραπλησίη ἡ κάθαρσις τοῖσι Λυδοῖσι καὶ τοῖσι Ελλησι. One remarkable proof, amongst many, of the deep hold which this idea took of the greatest minds in Greece, that serious mischief would fall upon the community if family quarrels or homicide remained without religious expiation, is to be found in the objections which Aristotle urges against the community of women proposed in the Platonic Republic. It could not be known what individuals stood in the relation of father, son, or brother: if, therefore, wrong or murder of kindred should take place, the appropriate religious atonements (*ai νομιζόμεναι λύσεις*) could not be applied and the crime would go unexpiated. (Aristot. Polit. ii. 1, 14. Compare Thucyd. i. 125–128.)

latter, and we may perhaps reasonably suspect that they borrowed it from the former. The oldest instance known to us of expiation for homicide was contained in the epic poem of the Milesian Arktinus,¹ wherein Achillēs is purified by Odysseus for the murder of Thersitēs: several others occurred in the later or Hesiodic epic—Héraklēs, Pēleus, Bellerophōn, Alkmædōn, Amphiktyōn, Poemander, Triopas,—from whence they probably passed through the hands of the logographers to Apollodōrus, Diodōrus, and others.² The purification of the murderer was originally operated, not by the hands of any priest or specially sanctified man, but by those of a chief or king, who goes through the appropriate ceremonies in the manner recounted by Herodotus in his pathetic narrative respecting Crœsus and Adrastus.

The idea of a special taint of crime, and of the necessity as well as the sufficiency of prescribed religious ceremonies as a means of removing it, appears thus to have got footing in Grecian practice subsequent to the time of Homer. The peculiar rites or orgies, composed or put together by Onomakritus, Methapus,³ and other men of more than the ordinary piety, were founded upon a similar mode of thinking and adapted to the same mental exigencies. They were voluntarily religious manifestations, superinduced upon the old public sacrifices of the king or chiefs on behalf of the whole society, and of the father on his own family hearth. They marked out the details of divine service proper to appease or gratify the god to whom they were addressed, and to procure for the believers who went through them his blessings and protection here or hereafter—the exact performance of the divine service in all its specialty was held necessary, and thus the priests or Hierophants, who alone were familiar with the ritual, acquired a commanding position.⁴ Generally speaking, these peculiar

¹ See the *Frags.* of the *Æthiopis* of Arktinus, in Dūntzer's Collection, p. 16.

² The references for this are collected in Lobeck's *Aglaophamos. Epimetr. ii. ad Orphica*, p. 968.

³ Pausanias (iv. 1, 5)—μετεκόσμησε γὰρ καὶ Μέθαπος τῆς τελετῆς (the Eleusinian Orgies, carried by Kaukon from Eleusis into Messenia), ξστιν δ. Ο δὲ Μέθαπος γένος μὲν ἦν Ἀθηναῖος, τελετῆς τε καὶ ὀργίων παντοίων συνθέτης. Again, viii. 37, 3, Onomakritus Διονύσῳ συνέθηκον ὄργια, &c. This is another expression designating the same idea as the Rhēsus of Euripidēs, 944 —

Μυστηρίων τε τῶν ἀπορρήτων φανάς
Ἐδεικεν Ὄρφεύς.

⁴ Tēlinēs, the ancestor of the Syracusan despot Gelō, acquired great political power as possessing τὰ ἱπά τῶν χθονίων θεῶν (Herodot. vii. 153);

orgies obtained their admission and their influence at periods of distress, disease, public calamity and danger, or religious terror and despondency, which appear to have been but too frequent in their occurrence.

The minds of men were prone to the belief that what they were suffering arose from the displeasure of some of the gods, and as they found that the ordinary sacrifices and worship were insufficient for their protection, so they grasped at new suggestions proposed to them with the view of regaining the divine favour.¹ Such suggestions were more usually copied, either in whole or in part, from the religious rites of some foreign locality, or from some other portion of the Hellenic world; and in this manner many new sects or voluntary religious fraternities, promising to relieve the troubled conscience and to reconcile the sick or suffering with the offended gods, acquired permanent establishment as well as considerable influence. They were generally under the superintendence of hereditary families of priests, who imparted the rites of confirmation and purification to communicants generally; no one who went through the prescribed ceremonies being excluded. In many cases such ceremonies fell into the hands of jugglers, who volunteered their services to wealthy men, and degraded their profession as well by obtrusive venality as by extravagant promises.² Sometimes the price was lowered to bring them within reach of the poor and even of slaves. But the wide diffusion, and the number of voluntary communicants of these solemnities, proves

he and his family became hereditary Hierophants of these ceremonies. How Têlinêς acquired the *ἱρὰ*, Herodotus cannot say—ὅθεν δὲ αὐτὰ ἔλαβε, ἡ αὐτὸς ἐκτήσατο, τούτο οὐκ ἔχω εἰπαί. Probably there was a traditional legend, not inferior in sanctity to that of Eleusis, tracing them to the gift of Dêmêtêr herself.

¹ See Josephus cont. Apiôn. ii. c. 35; Hesych. Θεοὶ ξένοι; Strabo, x. p. 471; Plutarch, Περὶ Δεισιδαιμον. c. iii. p. 166; c. vii. p. 167.

² Plato, Republ. ii. p. 364; Demosthen. de Coronâ, c. 79, p. 313. The δεισιδαιμῶν of Theophrastus cannot be comfortable without receiving the Orphic communion monthly from the Orpheotelestae (Theophr. Char. xvi.). Compare Plutarch, Περὶ τοῦ μὴ χρᾶν ἔμετρα, &c., c. 25, p. 400. The comic writer Phrynicus indicates the existence of these rites of religious excitement, at Athens, during the Peloponnesian war. See the short fragment of his *Kρόνος*, ap. Schol. Aristoph. Aves, 989—

‘Ἄντρος χορεύει, καὶ τὰ τοῦ θεοῦ καλῶς’
Βούλει Διοπείθη μεταδράμω καὶ τύμπανα;

Diopethêς was a *χρησμολόγος*, or collector and deliverer of prophecies, which he sung (or rather, perhaps, recited) with solemnity and emphasis, in public, *ἴστε ποιοῦντες χρησμούς αὐτὸς Διδόσας* ζδειν Διοπείθει τῷ παραμανούμενῳ. (Ameipsias ap. Schol. Aristophan. *ut sup.*, which illustrates Thucyd. ii. 21.)

how much they fell in with the feeling of the time and how much respect they enjoyed—a respect which the more conspicuous establishments, such as Eleusis and Samothrace, maintained for several centuries. And the visit of the Kretan Epimenidēs to Athens—in the time of Solōn, at a season of the most serious disquietude and dread of having offended the gods—illustrates the tranquillising effect of new orgies¹ and rites of absolution, when enjoined by a man standing high in the favour of the gods and reputed to be the son of a nymph. The supposed Erythraean Sibyl, and the earliest collection of Sibylline prophecies,² afterwards so much multiplied and interpolated, and referred (according to Grecian custom) to an age even earlier than Homer, appear to belong to a date not long posterior to Epimenidēs. Other oracular verses, such as those of Bakis, were treasured up in Athens and other cities: the sixth century before the Christian æra was fertile in these kinds of religious manifestations.

Amongst the special rites and orgies of the character just described, those which enjoyed the greatest Pan-Hellenic reputation were attached to the Idæan Zeus in Krête, to Dêmêtêr at Eleusis, to the Kabeiri in Samothrace, and to Dionysos at Delphi and Thebes.³ That they were all to a great degree analogous is shown by the way in which they unconsciously run together and become confused in the minds of various authors. The ancient inquirers themselves were unable to distinguish one from the other, and we must be content to submit to the like ignorance. But we see enough to satisfy us of the general fact, that during the century and a half which elapsed between

¹ Plutarch, Solōn, c. 12; Diogen. Laërt. i. 110.

² See Klausen, “Æneas und die Penaten:” his chapter on the connexion between the Grecian and Roman Sibylline collections is among the most ingenious of his learned book. Book ii. pp. 210–240: see Steph. Byz. v. Γέργυις.

To the same age belong the *χρησμοί* and *καθαρμοί* of Abaris and his marvellous journey through the air upon an arrow (Herodot. iv. 36).

Epimenidēs also composed *καθαρμοί* in epic verse; his *Κουρῆτων* and *Κορυβάντων γένεσις*, and his four thousand verses respecting Minōs and Rhadamanthys, if they had been preserved, would let us fully into the ideas of a religious mystic of that age respecting the antiquities of Greece. (Strabo, x. p. 474; Diogen. Laërt. i. 10.) Among the poems ascribed to Hesiod were comprised not only the *Melampodia*, but also *Ἐπη μαντικὰ* and *Ἐγγύθεις ἐπὶ τέρασιν*. Pausan. ix. 31, 4.

³ Among other illustrations of this general resemblance, may be counted an epitaph of Kallimachus upon an aged priestess, who passed from the service of Dêmêtêr to that of the Kabeiri, then to that of Cybelê, having the superintendence of many young women. Kallimachus, Epigram. 42, p. 308, ed. Ernest.

the opening of Egypt to the Greeks and the commencement of their struggle with the Persian kings, the old religion was largely adulterated by importations from Egypt, Asia Minor,¹ and Thrace. The rites grew to be more furious and ecstatic, exhibiting the utmost excitement, bodily as well as mental: the legends became at once more coarse, more tragical, and less pathetic. The manifestations of this frenzy were strongest among the women, whose religious susceptibilities were often found extremely unmanageable,² and who had everywhere congregative occasional ceremonies of their own, apart from the men—indeed, in the case of the colonists, especially of the Asiatic colonists, the women had been originally women of the country, and as such retained to a great degree their non-Hellenic manners and feelings.³ The god Dionysos,⁴ whom the legends described as clothed in feminine attire, and leading

¹ Plutarch (Defect. Oracul. c. 10, p. 415) treats these countries as the original seat of the worship of Dæmons (wholly or partially bad, and intermediate between gods and men), and their religious ceremonies as of a corresponding character: the Greeks were borrowers from them, according to him, both of the doctrine and of the ceremonies.

² Strabo, vii. p. 297. “Απαντες γάρ της δεισιδαιμονίας ἀρχηγούς οἴνοται τὰς γυναικας· αὐταὶ δὲ καὶ τοὺς ἄνδρας προκαλοῦνται ἐς τὰς ἐπὶ πλέον θεραπειας τῶν θεῶν, καὶ ἑορτὰς, καὶ ποτνιασμούς. Plato (De Legg. x. pp. 909, 910) takes great pains to restrain this tendency on the part of sick or suffering persons, especially women, to introduce new sacred rites into his city.

³ Herodot. i. 146. The wives of the Ionic original settlers at Miletos were Karian women, whose husbands they slew.

The violences of the Karian worship are attested by what Herodotus says of the Karian residents in Egypt, at the festival of Isis at Busiris. The Egyptians at this festival manifested their feeling by beating themselves, the Karians by cutting their faces with knives (ii. 61). The *Καρικὴ μούσα* became proverbial for funeral wailings (Plato, Legg. vii. p. 800): the unmeasured effusions and demonstrations of sorrow for the departed, sometimes accompanied with cutting and mutilation self-inflicted by the mourner, was a distinguishing feature in Asiatics and Egyptians as compared with Greeks. Plutarch, Consolat. ad Apollon. c. 22, p. 123. Mournful feeling was, in fact, a sort of desecration of the genuine and primitive Grecian festival, which was a season of cheerful harmony and social enjoyment, wherein the god was believed to sympathise (εὐφροσύνη). See Xenophanēs ap. Aristot. Rhetor. ii. 25; Xenophan. Frigm. I, ed. Schneidewin; Theognis, 776; Plutarch, De Superstit. p. 169. The unfavourable comments of Dionysius of Halikarnassus, in so far as they refer to the festivals of Greece, apply to the foreign corruptions, not to the native character, of Grecian worship.

⁴ The Lydian Hēraklēs was conceived and worshipped as a man in female attire: this idea occurs often in the Asiatic religions. Mencke, Lydiaca, c. 8, p. 22. Διόνυσος ἔρδην καὶ θῆλυς. Aristid. Or. iv. 28; Aeschyl. Frigm. Edoni, ap. Aristoph. Thesmoph. 135. Ποδαπὸς δὲ γύννις; τις πάτρα; τις η στολή;

a troop of frenzied women, inspired a temporary ecstasy. Those who resisted the inspiration, being disposed to disobey his will, were punished either by particular judgements or by mental terrors; while those who gave full loose to the feeling, in the appropriate season and with the received solemnities, satisfied his exigencies, and believed themselves to have procured immunity from such disquietudes for the future.¹ Crowds of women, clothed with fawn-skins and bearing the sanctified thyrsus, flocked to the solitudes of Parnassus, or Kithærôn, or Taygetus, during the consecrated triennial period, passed the night there with torches, and abandoned themselves to demonstrations of frantic excitement, with dancing and clamorous invocation of the god. They were said to tear animals limb from limb, to devour the raw flesh, and to cut themselves without feeling the wound.² The men yielded to a similar impulse by noisy revels in the streets, sounding the cymbals and tambourine, and carrying the image of the god in procession.³ It deserves to be remarked that the Athenian women never practised these periodical mountain excursions, so common among the rest of the Greeks: they had their feminine solemnities of the Thesmophoria,⁴ mournful in their character and accompanied with fasting, and their separate congregations at

¹ Melampus cures the women (whom Dionysos has struck mad for their resistance to his rites), παραλαβὼν τοὺς δυνατωτάτους τῶν νεανίων μετ' ἀλαλαγμοῦ καὶ τίνος ἐνθέου χορέας. Apollodôr. ii. 2, 7. Compare Eurip. Bacch. 861.

Plato (Legg. vii. p. 790) gives a similar theory of the healing effect of the Korybantic rites, which cured vague and inexplicable terrors of the mind by means of dancing and music conjoined with religious ceremonies—αἱ τὰ τῶν Κορυβάντων ιδματα τελοῦσαι (the practitioners were women), αἱ τῶν ἐκφρόνων Βακχειών ιάσεις—ἡ τῶν ζεωθεν κρατεῖ κίνησις προσφερομένη τὴν ἐντὸς φοβερὰν οὖσαν καὶ μανικὴν κίνησιν—δρχουμένους δὲ καὶ αὐλουμένους μετὰ θεῶν, οἷς ἀν καλλιερήσαντες ἔκαστοι θύωσιν, κατειργάσατο ἀντὶ μανικῶν ἥμιν διαθέτεων ἔξεις ζυφρονας ἔχειν.

² Described in the Bacchæ of Euripidēs (140, 735, 1135, &c.). Ovid, Trist. iv. i. 41. “Utque suum Bacchis non sentit saucia vulnus, Cum fuit Eridon exululata jugis.” In a fragment of the poet Alkman, a Lydian by birth, the Bacchanal nymphs are represented as milking the lioness, and making cheese of the milk, during their mountain excursions and festivals. (Alkman. Fragn. 14, Schn. Compare Aristid. Orat. iv. p. 29.) Clemens Alexand. Admonit. ad Gent. p. 9, Sylb.; Lucian, Dionysos, c. 3, t. iii. p. 77, Hemsterh.

³ See the tale of Skylēs in Herod. iv. 79, and Athenaeus, x. p. 445. Herodotus mentions that the Scythians abhorred the Bacchic ceremonies, accounting the frenzy which belonged to them to be disgraceful and monstrous.

⁴ Plutarch, De Isid. et Osir. c. 69, p. 378; Schol. ad Aristoph. Thesmoph. There were, however, Bacchic ceremonies practised to a certain extent by the Athenian women. (Aristoph. Lysist. 388.)

the temples of Aphrodité, but without any extreme or unseemly demonstrations. The state festival of the Dionysia, in the city of Athens, was celebrated with dramatic entertainments, and the once rich harvest of Athenian tragedy and comedy was thrown up under its auspices. The ceremonies of the Kurêtes in Krête, originally armed dances in honour of the Idæan Zeus, seems also to have borrowed from Asia so much of fury, of self-infliction, and of mysticism, that they became at last inextricably confounded with the Phrygian Korybantes, or worshippers of the Great Mother; though it appears that Grecian reserve always stopped short of the irreparable self-mutilation of Atys.

The influence of the Thracian religion upon that of the Greeks cannot be traced in detail, but the ceremonies contained in it were of a violent and fierce character, like the Phrygian, and acted upon Hellas in the same general direction as the latter. And the like may be said of the Egyptian religion, which was in this case the more operative, inasmuch as all the intellectual Greeks were naturally attracted to go and visit the wonders on the banks of the Nile; the powerful effect produced upon them is attested by many evidences, but especially by the interesting narrative of Herodotus. Now the Egyptian ceremonies were at once more licentious, and more profuse in the outpouring both of joy and sorrow than the Greek: ¹ but a still greater difference sprang from the extraordinary power, separate mode of life, minute observances, and elaborate organisation of the priesthood. The ceremonies of Egypt were multitudinous, but the legends concerning them were framed by the priest, and, as a general rule, seemingly, known to the priests alone: at least they were not intended to be publicly talked of, even by pious men. They were "holy stories," which it was sacrilege publicly to mention, and which from this very prohibition only took firmer hold of the minds of the Greek visitors who heard them. And thus the element of secrecy and mystic silence—foreign to Homer and only faintly glanced at in Hesiod—if it was not originally derived from Egypt, at least received from thence its greatest stimulus and diffusion. The character of the legends themselves was naturally affected by this change from publicity to secrecy: the secrets when revealed would be such as to justify by their own tenor the interdict on public divulgation: instead of being

¹ "Ægyptiaca numina fere plangoribus gaudent, Græca plerumque choreis, barbara autem strepitu cymbalistarum et tympanistarum et choraularum." (Apuleius, *De Genio Socratis*, v. ii. p. 149, Oudend.)

adapted, like the Homeric *mythe*, to the universal sympathies and hearty interest of a crowd of hearers, they would derive their impressiveness from the tragical, mournful, extravagant, or terror-striking character of the incidents.¹ Such a tendency, which appears explicable and probable even on general grounds, was in this particular case rendered still more certain by the coarse taste of the Egyptian priests. That any reconcile doctrine, religious or philosophical, was attached to the mysteries or contained in the holy stories, has never been shown, and is improbable, though the affirmative has been asserted by learned men.

Herodotus seems to have believed that the worship and ceremonies of Dionysos generally were derived by the Greeks from Egypt, brought over by Kadmus, and taught by him to Melampus. And the latter appears in the Hesiodic Catalogue as having cured the daughters of Proetus of the mental temper, with which they had been smitten by Dionysos for rejecting his ritual. He cured them by introducing the Bacchic dance and fanatical excitement: this mythical incident is the most ancient mention of the Dionysiac solemnities presented in the same character as they bear in Euripides. It is the general tendency of Herodotus to apply the theory of derivation from Egypt far too extensively to Grecian institutions: the orgies of Dionysos were not originally borrowed from thence, though they may have been much modified by connexion with Egypt as well as with Asia. The remarkable *mythe* composed by Onomakritus respecting the dismemberment of Zagreus was founded upon an Egyptian tale very similar respecting the body of Osiris, who was supposed to be identical with Dionysos.² Nor was it unsuitable to the reckless fury of the Bacchanals during their state of temporary

¹ The legend of Dionysos and Prosymnos, as it stands in Clemens, could never have found place in an epic poem (Admonit. ad Gent. p. 22 Sylb.). Compare page 11 of the same work, where, however, he so confounds together Phrygian, Bacchic, and Eleusinian mysteries, that one cannot distinguish them apart.

The author called Demetrius Phalereus says about the legends belonging to these ceremonies—*Διὸς καὶ τὰ μυστήρια λέγεται ἐν ἀλληγορίαις πρὸς ἔκπληξιν καὶ φοίκην, ὥσπερ ἐν σκέψει καὶ νυκτὶ.* (De Interpretatione, c. 101.)

² See the curious treatise of Plutarch, *De Isid. et Osirid.* c. 11-14, p. 355, and his elaborate attempt to allegorise the legend. He seems to have conceived that the Thracian Orpheus had first introduced into Greece the mysteries both of Démêtêr and Dionysos, copying them from those of Isis and Osiris in Egypt. See *Fragm.* 84, from one of his lost works, *t. v.* p. 891, ed. Wyttensb.

excitement, which found a still more awful expression in the mythe of Pentheus,—torn in pieces by his own mother Agavē at the head of her companions in the ceremony, as an intruder upon the feminine rites, as well as a scoffer at the god.¹ A passage in the Iliad (the authenticity of which has been contested, but even as an interpolation it must be old)² also recounts how Lykurgus was struck blind by Zeus, for having chased away with a whip, “the nurses of the mad Dionysos,” and for having frightened the god himself into the sea to take refuge in the arms of Thetis: while the fact that Dionysos is so frequently represented in his mythes as encountering opposition and punishing the refractory, seems to indicate that his worship under its ecstatic form was a late phænomenon and introduced not without difficulty. The mythical Thracian Orpheus was attached as Eponymos to a new sect, who seem to have celebrated the ceremonies of Dionysos with peculiar care, minuteness, and fervour, besides observing various rules in respect to food and clothing. It was the opinion of Herodotus, that these rules, as well as the Pythagorean, were borrowed from Egypt. But whether this be the fact or not, the Orphic brotherhood is itself both an evidence, and a cause, of the increased importance of the worship of Dionysos, which indeed is attested by the great dramatic poets of Athens.

The Homeric Hymns present to us, however, the religious ideas and legends of the Greeks at an earlier period, when the enthusiastic and mystic tendencies had not yet acquired their full development. Though not referable to the same age or to the same author as either the Iliad or the Odyssey, they do to a certain extent continue the same stream of feeling, and the same mythical tone and colouring, as these poems—manifesting but little evidence of Egyptian, Asiatic, or Thracian adulterations. The difference is striking between the god Dionysos as he appears in the Homeric Hymn and in the *Bacchæ* of Euripidēs. The hymnographer describes him as standing on the sea-shore, in the guise of a beautiful and richly-clothed youth, when Tyrrhenian pirates suddenly approach: they seize and bind him and drag him on board their vessel. But the bonds which they employ burst spontaneously, and leave the god free. The steersman, perceiving this with affright, points

¹ Aeschylus had dramatised the story of Pentheus as well as that of Lykurgus: one of his tetralogies was the *Lykurgeia* (Dindorf, *Aesch.* *Frags.* 115). A short allusion to the story of Pentheus appears in *Eumeid.* 25. Compare Sophokl. *Antigon.* 985, and the *Scholia*.

² Iliad, vi. 130. See the remarks of Mr. Payne Knight *ad loc.*

out to his companions that they have unwittingly laid hands on a god — perhaps Zeus himself, or Apollo, or Poseidôn. He conjures them to desist, and to replace Dionysos respectfully on the shore, lest in his wrath he should visit the ship with wind and hurricane: but the crew deride his scruples, and Dionysos is carried prisoner out to sea with the ship under full sail. Miraculous circumstances soon attest both his presence and his power. Sweet-scented wine is seen to flow spontaneously about the ship, the sail and mast appear adorned with vine and ivy-leaves, and the oar-pegs with garlands. The terrified crew now too late entreat the helmsman to steer his course for the shore, and crowd round him for protection on the poop. But their destruction is at hand: Dionysos assumes the form of a lion—a bear is seen standing near him—this bear rushes with a loud roar upon the captain, while the crew leap overboard in their agony of fright, and are changed into dolphins. There remains none but the discreet and pious steersman, to whom Dionysos addresses words of affectionate encouragement, revealing his name, parentage, and dignity.¹

This hymn, perhaps produced at the Naxian festival of Dionysos, and earlier than the time when the dithyrambic chorus became the established mode of singing the praise and glory of that god, is conceived in a spirit totally different from that of the Bacchic *Teletæ*, or special rites which the *Bacchæ* of Euripidês so abundantly extol—rites introduced from Asia by Dionysos himself at the head of a *thiasus* or troop of enthusiastic women—inflaming with temporary frenzy the minds of the women of Thebes—not communicable except to those who approach as pious worshippers—and followed by the most tragical results to all those who fight against the

¹ See Homer, Hymn 5, *Διόνυσος ή Ληστραι*.—The satirical drama of Euripidês, the *Cyclôps*, extends and alters this old legend. Dionysos is carried away by the Tyrrhenian pirates, and Silênuſ at the head of the Bacchanals goes everywhere in search of him (Eur. Cyc. 112). The pirates are instigated against him by the hatred of Hêrê, which appears frequently as a cause of mischief to Dionysos (Bacchæ, 286). Hêrê in her anger had driven him mad when a child, and he had wandered in this state over Egypt and Syria; at length he came to Cybela in Phrygia, was purified (*καθαρθεῖς*) by Rhea, and received from her female attire (Apollod. iii. 5, 1, with Heyne's note). This seems to have been the legend adopted to explain the old verse of the Iliad, as well as the maddening attributes of the god generally.

There was a standing antipathy between the priestesses and the religious establishments of Hêrê and Dionysos (Plutarch, *Περὶ τῶν ἐν Πλάταιας Δαιδάλων*, c. 2, t. v. p. 755, ed. Wytt.). Plutarch ridicules the legendary reason commonly assigned for this, and provides a symbolical explanation which he thinks very satisfactory.

god.¹ The Bacchic Teletæ, and the Bacchic feminine frenzy, were importations from abroad, as Euripidēs represents them, engrafted upon the joviality of the primitive Greek Dionysia ; they were borrowed, in all probability, from more than one source, and introduced through more than one channel, the Orphic life or brotherhood being one of the varieties. Strabo ascribes to this latter a Thracian original, considering Orpheus, Musæus, and Eumolpus, as having been all Thracians.² It is curious to observe how, in the Bacchæ of Euripidēs, the two distinct and even conflicting ideas of Dionysos come alternately forward ; sometimes the old Grecian idea of the jolly and exhilarating god of wine—but more frequently the recent and important idea of the terrific and irresistible god who unseats the reason, and whose *astrus* can only be appeased by a willing, though temporary obedience. In the fanatical impulse which inspired the votaries of the Asiatic Rhea or Cybelê, or of the Thracian Kotys, there was nothing of spontaneous joy ; it was a sacred madness, during which the soul appeared to be surrendered to a stimulus from without, and accompanied by preternatural strength and temporary sense of power³—altogether distinct from the unrestrained hilarity of the original Dionysia, as we see them in the rural demes of Attica, or in the gay city of Tarentum. There was indeed a side on which the two bore some analogy, inasmuch as, according to the religious point of

¹ Eurip. *Bacch.* 325, 464, &c.

² Strabo, x. p. 471. Compare Aristid. Or. iv. p. 28.

³ In the lost *Xantria* of Æschylus, in which seems to have been included the tale of Pentheus, the goddess Λύστα was introduced, stimulating the Bacchæ, and creating in them spasmodic excitement from head to foot : ἐκ ποδῶν δ' ἄνω ὑπέρχεται σπαραγμὸς εἰς ἄκρον κάρα, &c. (Fragm. 155, Dindorf.) His tragedy called *Edoni* also gave a terrific representation of the Bacchanals and their fury, exaggerated by the maddening music : Πίμπλησι μέλος, Μανίας ἐπαγωγὴν δροκλάν (Fr. 54).

Such also is the reigning sentiment throughout the greater part of the Bacchæ of Euripidēs ; it is brought out still more impressively in the mournful Atys of Catullus :—

“Dea magna, Dea Cybele, Dindymi Dea, Domina,
Procul a meā tuus sis furor omnis, hera, domo :
Alios age incitatos : alios age rabidos !”

We have only to compare this fearful influence with the description of Dikæopolis and his exuberant joviality in the festival of the rural Dionysia (Aristoph. *Acharn.* 1051 *seq.* ; see also Plato, Legg. i. p. 637), to see how completely the foreign innovations recoloured the old Grecian Dionysos—Διόνυσος πολυγνήθης, who appears also in the scene of Dionysos and Ariadnē in the *Symposion* of Xenophôn, c. 9. The simplicity of the ancient Dionysiac processions is dwelt upon by Plutarch, *De Cupidine Divitiarum*, p. 527 ; and the original dithyramb addressed by Archilochus to Dionysos is an effusion of drunken hilarity (Archiloch. *Frag.* 69, Schneid.).

view of the Greeks, even the spontaneous joy of the vintage-feast was conferred by the favour and enlivened by the companionship of Dionysos. It was upon this analogy that the framers of the Bacchic orgies proceeded; but they did not the less disfigure the genuine character of the old Grecian Dionysia.

Dionysos is in the conception of Pindar the Paredros or companion in worship of Démêtêr.¹ The worship and religious estimate of the latter has by that time undergone as great a change as that of the former, if we take our comparison with the brief description of Homer and Hesiod: she has acquired² much of the awful and soul-disturbing attributes of the Phrygian Cybelê. In Homer, Démêtêr is the goddess of the corn-field, who becomes attached to the mortal man Jasiôn; an unhappy passion, since Zeus, jealous of the connexion between goddesses and men, puts him to death. In the Hesiodic Theogony, Démêtêr is the mother of Persephonê by Zeus, who permits Hadês to carry off the latter as his wife; moreover Démêtêr has, besides, by Jasiôn, a son called Plutos, born in Krête. Even from Homer to Hesiod, the legend of Démêtêr has been expanded and her dignity exalted; according to the usual tendency of Greek legend, the expansion goes on still further. Through Jasiôn, Démêtêr becomes connected with the mysteries of Samothrace; through Persephonê, with those of Eleusis. The former connexion it is difficult to follow out in detail, but the latter is explained and traced to its origin in the Homeric Hymn to Démêtêr.

Though we find different statements respecting the date as well as the origin of the Eleusinian mysteries, yet the popular belief of the Athenians, and the story which found favour at Eleusis, ascribed them to the presence and dictation of the goddess Démêtêr herself; just as the Bacchic rites are,

¹ Pindar, Isthm. vi. 3. *χαλκοκρότου πάρεδρον Δημήτερος*,—the epithet marks the approximation of Démêtêr to the Mother of the Gods. ἦ κροτάλων τυπάνων τ' ιαχή, σύν τε Βρόμος αὐλῶν Εὐαδεν (Homer. Hymn. xii.) ;—the Mother of the Gods was worshipped by Pindar himself along with Pan; she had in his time her temple and ceremonies at Thêbes (Pyth. iii. 78; Fragm. Dithyr. 5, and the Scholia *ad l.*) as well as, probably, at Athens (Pausan. i. 3, 3).

Dionysos and Démêtêr are also brought together in the chorus of Sophoklês, Antigonê, 1072, μέδεις δὲ παγκοίνοις Ἐλευσινίας Δηοῦς ἐν κόλποις; and in Kallimachus, Hymn. Cerer. 70. Bacchus or Dionysos are in the Attic tragedians constantly confounded with the Démêtrian Iacchos, originally so different,—a personification of the mystic word shouted by the Eleusinian communicants. See Strabo, x. p. 468.

² Euripidês in his Chorus in the Helena (1320 *seq.*) assigns to Démêtêr all the attributes of Rhea, and blends the two completely into one.

according to the *Bacchæ* of Euripiðēs, first communicated and enforced on the Greeks by the personal visit of Dionysos to Thêbes, the metropolis of the Bacchic ceremonies.¹ In the Eleusinian legend, preserved by the author of the Homeric Hymn, she comes voluntarily and identifies herself with Eleusis; her past abode in Krête being briefly indicated.² Her visit to Eleusis is connected with the deep sorrow caused by the loss of her daughter Persephonê, who had been seized by Hadês, while gathering flowers in a meadow along with the Oceanic Nymphs, and carried off to become his wife in the under-world. In vain did the reluctant Persephonê shriek and invoke the aid of her father Zeus: he had consented to give her to Hadês, and her cries were heard only by Hekatê and Hêlios. Dêmêtêr was inconsolable at the disappearance of her daughter, but knew not where to look for her: she wandered for nine days and nights with torches in search of the lost maiden without success. At length Hêlios, the "spy of gods and men," revealed to her, in reply to her urgent prayer, the rape of Persephonê, and the permission given to Hadês by Zeus. Dêmêtêr was smitten with anger and despair: she renounced Zeus and the society of Olympus, abstained from nectar and ambrosia, and wandered on earth in grief and fasting until her form could no longer be known. In this condition she came to Eleusis, then governed by the prince Keleos. Sitting down by a well at the wayside in the guise of an old woman, she was found by the daughters of Keleos, who came thither with their pails of brass for water. In reply to their questions, she told them that she had been brought by pirates from Krête to Thorikos, and had made her escape; she then solicited from them succour and employment as a servant or as a nurse. The damsels prevailed upon their mother Metaneira to receive her, and to entrust her with the nursing of the young Dêmophoôn, their late-born brother, the only son of Keleos. Dêmêtêr was received into the house of Metaneira, her dignified form still borne down by grief: she sat long silent, and could not be induced either to smile or to taste food, until the maid-servant Iambê, by jests and playfulness, succeeded in amusing and rendering her cheerful. She would not taste wine, but requested a peculiar mixture of barley-meal with water and the herb mint.³

¹ Sophokl. Antigon. Βακχᾶν μητρόπολιν Θήβαν.

² Homer, Hymn. Cerer. 123. The Hymn to Dêmêtêr has been translated, accompanied with valuable illustrative notes, by J. H. Voss (Heidelb. 1826).

³ Homer, Hymn. Cerer. 202-210.

The child Dêmophoðn, nursed by Dêmêtér, strove and grew up like a god, to the delight and astonishment of his parents: she gave him no food, but anointed him daily with ambrosia, and plunged him at night in the fire like a torch, where he remained unburnt. She would have rendered him immortal had she not been prevented by the indiscreet curiosity and alarm of Metaneira, who secretly looked in at night, and shrieked with horror at the sight of her child in the fire.¹ The indignant goddess, setting the infant on the ground, now revealed her true character to Metaneira: her wan and aged look disappeared, and she stood confess in the genuine majesty of her divine shape, diffusing a dazzling brightness which illuminated the whole house. "Foolish mother," she said, "thy want of faith has robbed thy son of immortal life. I am the exalted Dêmêtér, the charm and comfort both of gods and men: I was preparing for thy son exemption from death and old age; now it cannot be but he must taste of both. Yet shall he be ever honoured, since he has sat upon my knee, and slept in my arms. Let the people of Eleusis erect for me a temple and altar on yonder hill above the fountain: I will myself prescribe to them the orgies which they must religiously perform in order to propitiate my favour."²

The terrified Metaneira was incapable even of lifting up her child from the ground: her daughters entered at her cries, and began to embrace and tend their infant brother, but he sorrowed and could not be pacified for the loss of his divine nurse. All night they strove to appease the goddess.³

Strictly executing the injunctions of Dêmêtér, Keleos convoked the people of Eleusis, and erected the temple on the spot which she had pointed out. It was speedily completed, and Dêmêtér took up her abode in it, apart from the remaining gods, still pining with grief for the loss of her daughter, and withholding her beneficent aid from mortals. And thus

¹ This story was also told with reference to the Egyptian goddess Isis in her wanderings. See Plutarch, De Isid. et Osirid. c. 16, p. 357.

² Homer, Hymn. Cerer. 274—

"Οργια δ' αὐτὴν ἔγων ὑποθήσομαι, ὡς ἀν ἔπειτα
Ειναγέως ἔρδοντες ἐμὸν νόον ἵλασκησθε.

The same story is told in regard to the infant Achilles. His mother Thetis was taking similar measures to render him immortal, when his father Peleus interfered and prevented the consummation. Thetis immediately left him in great wrath. (Apollon. Rhod. iv. 866.)

³ Homer, Hymn. 290—

τοῦ δ' οὐ μειλίσσετο θυμὸς,
Χειρότεραι γὰρ δὴ μιν ἔχον τροφοὶ ηδὲ τιθῆναι.

she remained a whole year—a desperate and terrible year :¹ in vain did the oxen draw the plough, and in vain was the barley-seed cast into the furrow—Démêtér suffered it not to emerge from the earth. The human race would have been starved, and the gods would have been deprived of their honours and sacrifice, had not Zeus found means to conciliate her. But this was a hard task ; for Démêtér resisted the entreaties of Iris and of all the other goddesses and gods whom Zeus successively sent to her. She would be satisfied with nothing less than the recovery of her daughter. At length Zeus sent Hermès to Hadês, to bring Persephonê away : Persephonê joyfully obeyed, but Hadês prevailed upon her before she departed to swallow a grain of pomegranate, which rendered it impossible for her to remain the whole year away from him.²

With transport did Démêtér receive back her lost daughter, and the faithful Hekatê sympathised in the delight felt by both at the reunion.³ It was now an easier undertaking to reconcile her with the gods. Her mother Rhea, sent down expressly by Zeus, descended from Olympus on the fertile Rharian plain, then smitten with barrenness like the rest of the earth : she succeeded in appeasing the indignation of Démêtér, who consented again to put forth her relieving hand. The buried seed came up in abundance, and the earth was covered with fruit and flowers. She would have wished to retain Persephonê constantly with her ; but this was impossible, and she was obliged to consent that her daughter should go down for one-third of each year to the house of Hadês, departing from her every spring at the time when the seed is sown. She then revisited Olympus, again to dwell with the gods ; but before her departure she communicated to the daughters of Keleos, and to Keleos himself, together with Triptolemus, Dioklês, and Eumolpus, the divine service and the solemnities which she required to be observed in her honour.⁴ And thus began the venerable mysteries of Eleusis, at her special command : the lesser mysteries, celebrated in February, in honour of Persephonê ;

¹ Homer, II. Cer. 305—

Αἰνότατον δ' ἐνιαυτὸν ἐπὶ χθόνα πουλυβότειραν
Ποίησ' ἀνθρώποις, ἵδε κύντατον.

² Hymn, v. 375.

⁴ Hymn, v. 475—

³ Hymn, v. 443.

‘Η δὲ κιοῦσα θεμιστοπόλοις βασιλεῦσι
Δεῖξεν, Τριπτολέμῳ τε, Διοκλέῃ τε πληξίππῳ,
Ευμόλου τε βίῃ, Κελεῷ δέ ήγητοι λαῶν,
Δρησμοσύνην ιερῶν καὶ ἐπέφραδεν ὄργια παισὶν
Πρεσβυτέρης Κελεοῖ, &c.

the greater, in August, to the honour of Démêtêr herself. Both are jointly patronesses of the holy city and temple.

Such is a brief sketch of the temple legend of Eleusis, set forth at length in the Homeric Hymn to Démêtêr. It is interesting not less as a picture of the Mater Dolorosa (in the mouth of an Athenian, Démêtêr and Persephonê were always The Mother and Daughter, by excellence), first an agonised sufferer, and then finally glorified—the weal and woe of man being dependent upon her kindly feeling,—than as an illustration of the nature and growth of Grecian legend generally. Though we now read this Hymn as pleasing poetry, to the Eleusinians, for whom it was composed, it was genuine and sacred history. They believed in the visit of Démêtêr to Eleusis, and in the Mysteries as a revelation from her, as implicitly as they believed in her existence and power as a goddess. The Eleusinian psalmist shares this belief in common with his countrymen, and embodies it in a continuous narrative, in which the great goddesses of the place, as well as the great heroic families, figure in inseparable conjunction. Keleos is the son of the Eponymous hero Eleusis, and his daughters, with the old epic simplicity, carry their basons to the well for water. Eumolpus, Triptolemus, Dioklês, heroic ancestors of the privileged families who continued throughout the historical times of Athens to fulfil their special hereditary functions, in the Eleusinian solemnities, are among the immediate recipients of inspiration from the goddess: but chiefly does she favour Metaneira and her infant son Dêmophôn, for the latter of whom her greatest boon is destined, and intercepted only by the weak faith of the mother. Moreover every incident in the Hymn has a local colouring and a special reference. The well overshadowed by an olive-tree near which Démêtêr had rested, the stream Kallichoros and the temple-hill, were familiar and interesting places in the eyes of every Eleusinian; the peculiar posset prepared from barley-meal with mint was always tasted by the Mysts (or communicants) after a prescribed fast, as an article in the ceremony,—while it was also the custom, at a particular spot in the processional march, to permit the free interchange of personal jokes and taunts upon individuals for the general amusement. And these two customs are connected in the Hymn with the incidents, that Démêtêr herself had chosen the posset as the first interruption of her long and melancholy fast, and that her sorrowful thoughts had been partially diverted by the coarse playfulness of the servant-maid Iambê. In the enlarged

representation of the Eleusinian ceremonies, which became established after the incorporation of Eleusis with Athens, the part of Iambê herself was enacted by a woman, or man in woman's attire, of suitable wit and imagination, who was posted on the bridge over the Kephissos, and addressed to the passers-by in the procession,¹ especially the great men of Athens, saucy jeers probably not less piercing than those of Aristophanês on the stage. The torch-bearing Hekatê received a portion of the worship in the nocturnal ceremonies of the Eleusinia: this too is traced in the Hymn, to her kind and affectionate sympathy with the great goddesses.

Though all these incidents were sincerely believed by the Eleusinians as a true history of the past, and as having been the real initiatory cause of their own solemnities, it is not the less certain that they are simply mythes or legends, and not to be treated as history either actual or exaggerated. They do not take their start from realities of the past, but from realities of the present, combined with retrospective feeling and fancy, which fills up the blank of the aforesight in a manner at once plausible and impressive. What proportion of fact there may be in the legend, or whether there be any at all, it is impossible to ascertain and useless to inquire; for the story did not acquire belief from its approximation to real fact, but from its perfect harmony with Eleusinian faith and feeling, and from the absence of any standard of historical credibility. The little town of Eleusis derived all its importance from the solemnity of the Dêmêtria, and the Hymn which we have been considering (probably at least as old as 600 B.C.) represents the town as it stood before its absorption into the larger unity of Athens, which seems to have produced an alteration of its legends and an increase of dignity in its great festival. In the faith of an Eleusinian, the religious as well as the patriotic antiquities of his native town were connected with this capital solemnity. The divine legend of the sufferings of Dêmêtêr and her visit to Eleusis was to him that which the heroic legend of Adrastus and the siege of Thebes was to a Sikyonian, or that of Erechtheus and Athêné to an Athenian—grouping together in the same scene and story the goddess and the heroic fathers of the town. If our information were fuller, we should probably find

¹ Aristophanês, *Vesp.* 1363. Hesych. v. Γεφυρίς. Suidas, v. Γεφυρίζων. Compare about the details of the ceremony, Clemens Alexandr. Admon. ad Gent. p. 13. A similar licence of unrestrained jocularity appears in the rites of Dêmêtêr in Sicily (Diodor. v. 4; see also Pausan. vii. 27, 4), and in the worship of Damia and Auxesia at Ægina (Herodot. v. 83).

abundance of other legends respecting the Démétria: the Gephyraei of Athens, to whom belonged the celebrated Harmodios and Aristogeitôn, and who possessed special Orgies of Démêtêr the Sorrowful, to which no man foreign to their Gens was ever admitted,¹ would doubtless have told stories not only different but contradictory; and even in other Eleusinian mythes we discover Eumolpus as king of Eleusis, son of Poseidôn, and a Thracian, completely different from the character which he bears in the Hymn before us.² Neither discrepancies nor want of evidence, in reference to alleged antiquities, shocked the faith of a non-historical public. What they wanted was a picture of the past, impressive to their feelings and plausible to their imagination: and it is important to the reader to remember, while he reads either the divine legends which we are now illustrating, or the heroic legends to which we shall soon approach, that he is dealing with a past which never was present,—a region essentially mythical, neither approachable by the critic nor measurable by the chronologer.

The tale respecting the visit of Démêtêr, which was told by the ancient Gens, called the Phytalids,³ in reference to another temple of Démêtêr between Athens and Eleusis, and also by the Megarians in reference to a Démétrion near their city, acquired under the auspices of Athens still further extension. The goddess was reported to have first communicated to Triptolemus at Eleusis the art of sowing corn, which by his intervention was disseminated all over the earth. And thus the Athenians took credit to themselves for having been the medium of communication from the gods to man of all the inestimable blessings of agriculture which they affirmed to have been first exhibited on the fertile Rharian plain near Eleusis. Such pretensions are not to be found in the old Homeric Hymn. The festival of the Thesmophoria, celebrated in honour of Démêtêr Thesmophoros at Athens, was altogether different from the Eleusinia, in this material respect, as well as others, that all males were excluded and women

¹ Herodot. v. 61.

² Pausan. i. 38, 3; Apollodôr. iii. 15, 4. Heyne in his Note admits several persons named Eumolpus. Compare Isokratês, Panegyr. p. 55. Philochorus the Attic antiquary could not have received the legend of the Eleusinian Hymn, from the different account which he gave respecting the rape of Persephonê (Philoch. Fragm. 46, ed. Didot), and also respecting Keleos (Fr. 28, ibid.).

³ Phytalus, the Eponym or godfather of this gens, had received Démêtêr as a guest in his house, when she first presented mankind with the fruit of the fig-tree. (Pausan. i. 37, 2.)

only were allowed to partake in it: the surname Thesmophoros gave occasion to new legends in which the goddess was glorified as the first authoress of laws and legal sanctions to mankind.¹ This festival for women apart and alone, was also celebrated at Thebes, at Paros, at Ephesus, and in many other parts of Greece.²

Altogether, Dêmêtêr and Dionysos, as the Grecian counterparts of the Egyptian Isis and Osiris, seem to have been the great recipients of the new sacred rites borrowed from Egypt, before the worship of Isis in her own name was introduced into Greece: their solemnities became more frequently recluse and mysterious than those of the other deities. The importance of Dêmêtêr to the collective nationality of Greece may be gathered from the fact that her temple was erected at Thermopylæ, the spot where the Amphiktyonic assemblies were held, close to the temple of the Eponymous hero Amphiktyôn himself, and under the surname of the Amphiktyonic Dêmêtêr.³

We now pass to another and not less important celestial personage—Apollo.

The legends of Délos and Delphi, embodied in the Homeric Hymn to Apollo, indicate, if not a greater dignity, at least a more widely diffused worship of that god than even of Dêmêtêr. The Hymn is, in point of fact, an aggregate of two separate compositions, one emanating from an Ionic bard at Délos, the other from Delphi. The first details the birth, the second the mature divine efficiency, of Apollo; but both alike present the unaffected charm as well as the characteristic peculiarities of Grecian mythical narrative. The hymnographer sings, and his hearers accept in perfect good faith, a history of the past; but it is a past, imagined partly as an introductory explanation to the present, partly as the means of glorifying the god. The island of Délos was the accredited birthplace of Apollo, and is also the place in which he chiefly delights, where the great and brilliant Ionic festival is periodically convened in his honour. Yet it is a rock narrow, barren and uninviting: how came so glorious a privilege to be awarded to it? This the poet takes upon himself to explain. Lêtô, pregnant with Apollo and persecuted by the jealous Hêrê,

¹ Kallimach. Hymn. Cerer. 19. Sophoklês, Triptolemos, Frag. 1. Cicero Legg. ii. 14, and the note of Servius ad Virgil. AEn. iv. 58.

² Xenophon, Hellen. v. 2, 29. Herodot. vi. 16, 134. ἔρκος Θεσμοφόρου Δήμητρος—τὰ ἐς ἔρσενα γύνοντος δέρβητα ιερά.

³ Herodot. vii. 200.

could find no spot wherein to give birth to her offspring. In vain did she address herself to numerous places in Greece, the Asiatic coast, and the intermediate islands; all were terrified at the wrath of Hérê, and refused to harbour her. As a last resort, she approached the rejected and repulsive island of Délos, and promised that if shelter were granted to her in her forlorn condition, the island should become the chosen resort of Apollo as well as the site of his temple with its rich accompanying solemnities.¹ Délos joyfully consented, but not without many apprehensions that the potent Apollo would despise her unworthiness, and not without exacting a formal oath from Lêtô,—who was then admitted to the desired protection, and duly accomplished her long and painful labour. Though Diônê, Rhea, Themis and Amphitritê came to soothe and succour her, yet Hérê kept away the goddess presiding over childbirth, Eileithyia, and thus cruelly prolonged her pangs. At length Eileithyia came, and Apollo was born. Hardly had Apollo tasted, from the hands of Themis, the immortal food, nectar and ambrosia, when he burst at once his infant bands, and displayed himself in full divine form and strength, claiming his characteristic attributes of the bow and the harp, and his privileged function of announcing beforehand to mankind the designs of Zeus. The promise made by Lêtô to Délos was faithfully performed: amidst the numberless other temples and groves which men provided for him, he ever preferred that island as his permanent residence, and there the Ionians with their wives and children, and all their “bravery,” congregated periodically from their different cities to glorify him. Dance and song and athletic contests adorned the solemnity, while the countless ships, wealth, and grace of the multitudinous Ionians had the air of an assembly of gods. The Delian maidens, servants of Apollo, sang hymns to the glory of the god, as well as of Artemis and Lêtô, intermingled with adventures of foregone men and women, to the delight of the listening crowd. The blind itinerant bard of Chios (composer of this the Homeric hymn, and confounded in antiquity with the author of the Iliad), having found honour and acceptance at this festival, commends himself, in a touching farewell strain, to the remembrance and sympathy of the Delian maidens.²

¹ According to another legend, Lêtô was said to have been conveyed from the Hyperboreans to Délos in twelve days, in the form of a she-wolf, to escape the jealous eye of Hérê. In connexion with this legend, it was affirmed that the she-wolves always brought forth their young only during these twelve days in the year (Aristot. Hist. Animal. vii. 35).

² Hom. Hymn. Apoll. i. 179.

But Délos was not an oracular spot: Apollo did not manifest himself there as revealer of the futurities of Zeus. A place must be found where this beneficent function, without which mankind would perish under the innumerable doubts and perplexities of life, may be exercised and rendered available. Apollo himself descends from Olympus to make choice of a suitable site: the hymnographer knows a thousand other adventures of the god which he might sing, but he prefers this memorable incident, the charter and patent of consecration for the Delphian temple. Many different places did Apollo inspect: he surveyed the country of the Magnêtes and the Perrhæbians, came to Iôlkos, and passed over from thence to Eubœa and the plain of Lelanton. But even this fertile spot did not please him: he crossed the Euripus to Bœotia, passed by Teumêssus and Mykalêssus, and the then inaccessible and unoccupied forest on which the city of Thebes afterwards stood. He next proceeded to Onchêstos, but the grove of Poseidôn was already established there; next across the Kêphissus to Okalea, Haliartus, and the agreeable plain and much-frequented fountain of Delphusa, or Tilphusa. Pleased with the place, Apollo prepared to establish his oracle there, but Tilphusa was proud of the beauty of her own site, and did not choose that her glory should be eclipsed by that of the god.¹ She alarmed him with the apprehension that the chariots which contended in her plain, and the horses and mules which watered at her fountain, would disturb the solemnity of his oracle; and she thus induced him to proceed onward to the southern side of Parnassus, overhanging the harbour of Krissa. Here he established his oracle, in the mountainous site not frequented by chariots and horses, and near to a fountain, which however was guarded by a vast and terrific serpent, once the nurse of the monster Typhaôn. This serpent Apollo slew with an arrow, and suffered its body to rot in the sun: hence the name of the place, Pythô,² and the surname of the Pythian Apollo. The plan of his temple being marked out, it was built by Trophônios and Agamêdês, aided by a crowd of forward auxiliaries from the neighbourhood. He now discovered with indignation, however, that Tilphusa had cheated him, and went back with swift step to resent it. "Thou shalt not thus," he said, "succeed in thy fraud and retain thy beautiful water: the glory of the place shall be mine, and not thine alone." Thus saying, he tumbled down a crag upon the fountain, and obstructed her limpid current; establish-

¹ Hom. Hymn. Apoll. 262.

² Hom. Hymn. 363—πύθεοθαι, to rot.

ing an altar for himself in a grove hard by near another spring, where men still worship him as Apollo Tilphusios, because of his severe vengeance upon the once beautiful Tilphusa.¹

Apollo next stood in need of chosen ministers to take care of his temple and sacrifice, and to pronounce his responses at Pythô. Descrying a ship, "containing many and good men," bound on traffic from the Minoan Knossus in Krête, to Pylus in Peloponnêsus, he resolved to make use of the ship and her crew for his purpose. Assuming the shape of a vast dolphin, he splashed about and shook the vessel so as to strike the mariners with terror, while he sent a strong wind, which impelled her along the coast of Peloponnêsus into the Corinthian Gulf, and finally to the harbour of Krissa, where she ran aground. The affrighted crew did not dare to disembark: but Apollo was seen standing on the shore in the guise of a vigorous youth, and inquired who they were and what was their business. The leader of the Krêtans recounted in reply their miraculous and compulsory voyage, when Apollo revealed himself as the author and contriver of it, announcing to them the honourable function and the dignified post to which he destined them.² They followed him by his orders to the rocky Pythô on Parnassus, singing the solemn Io-Paian such as it is sung in Krête, while the god himself marched at their head, with his fine form and lofty step, playing on the harp. He showed them the temple and site of the oracle, and directed them to worship him as Apollo Delphinios, because they had first seen him in the shape of a dolphin. "But how," they inquired, "are we to live in a spot where there is neither corn, nor vine, nor pasturage?" "Ye silly mortals," answered the god, "who look only for toil and privation, know that an easier lot is yours. Ye shall live by the cattle whom crowds of pious visitors will bring to the temple: ye shall need only the knife to be constantly ready for sacrifice.³ Your duty will be to guard my temple, and to officiate as ministers at my feasts: but if ye be guilty of wrong or insolence, either by word or deed, ye shall become the slaves of other men, and shall remain so for ever. Take heed of the word and the warning."

Such are the legends of Délos and Delphi, according to the

¹ Hom. Hymn. Apoll. 381. ² Hom. Hymn. Apoll. 475 *sqq.*

³ Homer. Hymn. Apoll. 535—

Homeric Hymn to Apollo. The specific functions of the god, and the chief localities of his worship, together with the surnames attached to them, are thus historically explained, being connected with his past acts and adventures. Though these are to us only interesting poetry, yet to those who heard them sung they possessed all the requisites of history, and were fully believed as such; not because they were partially founded in reality, but because they ran in complete harmony with the feelings; and, so long as that condition was fulfilled, it was not the fashion of the time to canvass truth or falsehood. The narrative is purely personal, without any discernible symbolised doctrine or allegory, to serve as a supposed ulterior purpose: the particular deeds ascribed to Apollo grow out of the general preconceptions as to his attributes, combined with the present realities of his worship. It is neither history nor allegory, but simple mythe or legend.

The worship of Apollo is among the most ancient, capital, and strongly marked facts of the Grecian world, and widely diffused over every branch of the race. It is older than the Iliad or Odyssey, in the latter of which both Pythô and Dêlos are noted, though Dêlos is not named in the former. But the ancient Apollo is different in more respects than one from the Apollo of later times. He is in a peculiar manner the god of the Trojans, unfriendly to the Greeks, and especially to Achilles; he has, moreover, only two primary attributes, his bow and his prophetic powers, without any distinct connexion either with the harp, or with medicine, or with the sun, all which in later times he came to comprehend. He becomes not only, as Apollo Karneius, the chief god of the Doric race, but also (under the surname of Patrôus) the great protecting divinity of the gentile tie among the Ionians:¹ he is moreover the guide and stimulus to Grecian colonisation, scarcely any colony being ever sent out without encouragement and direction from the oracle at Delphi: Apollo Archêgetês is one of his great surnames.² His temple lends sanctity to the meetings of the Amphiktyonic assembly, and he is always in filial subordination and harmony with his father Zeus: Delphi and Olympia are never found in conflict. In the Iliad, the warm and earnest patrons of the Greeks are Hêrê, Athénê, and

¹ Harpokration, v. Ἀπόλλων πατρῷος and Ἐρκεῖος Ζεύς. Apollo Delphinios also belongs to the Ionic Greeks generally. Strabo, iv. 179.

² Thucydid. vi. 3; Kallimach. Hymn. Apoll. 56—

Poseidôn: here too Zeus and Apollo are seen in harmony, for Zeus is decidedly well-inclined to the Trojans, and reluctantly sacrifices them to the importunity of the two great goddesses.¹ The worship of the Sminthian Apollo, in various parts of the Troad and the neighbouring territory, dates before the earliest periods of Æolic colonisation:² hence the zealous patronage of Troy ascribed to him in the Iliad. Altogether, however, the distribution and partialities of the gods in that poem are different from what they become in later times,—a difference which our means of information do not enable us satisfactorily to explain. Besides the Delphian temple, Apollo had numerous temples throughout Greece, and oracles at Abæ in Phôkis, on the Mount Ptôon, and at Tegyra in Bœotia, where he was said to have been born,³ at Branchidæ near Milêtus, at Klarus in Asia Minor, and at Patara in Lykia. He was not the only oracular god: Zeus at Dodona and at Olympia gave responses also: the gods or heroes Trophônias, Amphiaraus, Amphilochus, Mopsus, &c., each at his own sanctuary and in his own prescribed manner, rendered the same service.

The two legends of Delphi and Dêlos, above noticed, form of course a very insignificant fraction of the narratives which once existed respecting the great and venerated Apollo. They serve only as specimens, and as very early specimens,⁴ to illustrate what these divine mythes were, and what was the turn of Grecian faith and imagination. The constantly recurring festivals of the gods caused an incessant demand for new mythes respecting them, or at least for varieties and reproductions of the old mythes. Even during the third century of the Christian æra, in the time of the rhêtôr Menander, when the old forms of Paganism were waning and when the stock

¹ Iliad, iv. 30-46.

² Iliad, i. 38, 451; Stephan. Byz. ΙΛΙΟΝ, Τένεδος. See also Klausen, *Æneas und die Penaten*, b. i. p. 69. The worship of Apollo Sminthios and the festival of the Sminthia at Alexandria Troas lasted down to the time of Menander the rhêtôr, at the close of the third century after Christ.

³ Plutarch, *Defect. Oracul.* c. 5, p. 412; c. 8, p. 414; Steph. Byz. v. Τεγύρα. The Temple of the Ptôan Apollo had acquired celebrity before the days of the poet Asius. Pausan. ix. 23, 3.

⁴ The legend which Ephorus followed about the establishment of the Delphian temple was something radically different from the Homeric Hymn (Ephori Frigm. 70, ed. Didot); his narrative went far to politicise and rationalise the story. The progeny of Apollo was very numerous, and of the most diverse attributes; he was father of the Korybantes (Pherekydês, Frigm. 6, ed. Didot), as well as of Asklêpios and Aristæus (Schol. Apollon. Rhod. ii. 500; Apollodôr. iii. 10, 3).

of mythes in existence was extremely abundant, we see this demand in great force ; but it was incomparably more operative in those earlier times when the creative vein of the Grecian mind yet retained its pristine and unfaded richness. Each god had many different surnames, temples, groves, and solemnities ; with each of which was connected more or less of mythical narrative, originally hatched in the prolific and spontaneous fancy of a believing neighbourhood, to be afterwards expanded, adorned, and diffused by the song of the poet. The earliest subject of competition¹ at the great Pythian festival was the singing of a hymn in honour of Apollo : other *agones* were subsequently added, but the ode or hymn constituted the fundamental attribute of the solemnity : the Pythia at Sikyon and elsewhere were probably framed on a similar footing. So too at the ancient and celebrated Charitésia, or festival of the Charites, at Orchomenos, the rivalry of the poets in their various modes of composition both began and continued as the predominant feature :² and the inestimable treasures yet remaining to us of Attic tragedy and comedy, are gleanings from the once numerous dramas exhibited at the solemnity of the Dionysia. The Ephesians gave considerable rewards for the best hymns in honour of Artemis, to be sung at her temple.³ And the early lyric poets of Greece, though their works have not descended to us, devoted their genius largely to similar productions, as may be seen by the titles and fragments yet remaining.

Both the Christian and the Mahomedan religions have begun during the historical age, have been propagated from one common centre, and have been erected upon the ruins of a different pre-existing faith. With none of these particulars did Grecian Paganism correspond. It took rise in an age of imagination and feeling simply, without the restraints, as

¹ Strabo, ix. p. 421. Menander the rhētōr (Ap. Walz. Coll. Rhett. t. ix. p. 136) gives an elaborate classification of hymns to the gods, distinguishing them into nine classes—κλητικόλ, ἀποτεμπτικόλ, φυσικόλ, μυθικόλ, γενεαλογικόλ, πεπλασμένολ, εὐκτικοί ἀπεικτικοί, μικτοί :—the second class had reference to the temporary absence or departure of a god to some distant place, which were often admitted in the ancient religion. Sappho and Alkman in their *kletic* hymns invoked the gods from many different places,—τὴν μὲν γῆρ “Αρτεμιν ἐκ μυρίων μὲν ὄρέων, μυρίων δὲ πόλεων, ἔτι δὲ ποταμῶν, ἀνακαλεῖ,—also Aphrodité and Apollo, &c. All these songs were full of adventures and details respecting the gods,—in other words, of legendary matter.

² Pindar, Olymp. xiv.; Boeckh, Staatshaushaltung der Athener, Appendix, § xx. p. 357.

³ Alexander Ætolus, apud Macrobius, Saturn, v. 22.

well as without the aid, of writing or records, of history or philosophy. It was, as a general rule, the spontaneous product of many separate tribes and localities, imitation and propagation operating as subordinate causes ; it was moreover a primordial faith as far as our means of information enable us to discover.

These considerations explain to us two facts in the history of the early pagan mind. First, the divine mythes, the matter of their religion, constituted also the matter of their earliest history ; next, these mythes harmonised with each other only in their general types, but differed incurably in respect of particular incidents. The poet who sang a new adventure of Apollo, the trace of which he might have heard in some remote locality, would take care that it should be agreeable to the general conceptions which his hearers entertained respecting the god. He would not ascribe the cestus or amorous influences to Athénê, nor armed interference and the ægis to Aphroditê ; but, provided he maintained this general keeping, he might indulge his fancy without restraint in the particular events of the story.¹ The feelings and faith of his hearers went along with him, and there were no critical scruples to hold them back : to scrutinise the alleged proceedings of the gods was repulsive, and to disbelieve them impious. And thus these divine mythes, though they had their root simply in religious feelings, and though they presented great discrepancies of fact, served nevertheless as primitive matter of history to an early Greek : they were the only narratives, at once publicly accredited and interesting, which he possessed. To them were aggregated the heroic mythes (to which we shall proceed presently),—indeed the two are inseparably blended, gods, heroes, and men almost always appearing in the same picture,—analogous both in their structure and their genesis, and differing chiefly in the circumstance that they sprang from the type of a hero instead of from that of a god.

¹ The birth of Apollo and Artemis from Zeus and Lêtô is among the oldest and most generally admitted facts in the Grecian divine legends. Yet Æschylus did not scruple to describe Artemis publicly as daughter of Dêmêtér (Herodot. ii. 156 ; Pausan. viii. 37, 3). Herodotus thinks that he copied this innovation from the Egyptians, who affirmed that Apollo and Artemis were the sons of Dionysos and Isis.

The number and discrepancies of the mythes respecting each god are attested by the fruitless attempts of learned Greeks to escape the necessity of rejecting any of them by multiplying homonymous personages,—three persons named Zeus ; five named Athénê ; six named Apollo, &c. (Cicero, de Natur. Deor. iii. 21 ; Clemen. Alexand. Admon. ad Gent. p. 17.)

We are not to be astonished if we find Aphroditê, in the Iliad, born from Zeus and Dionê, and in the Theogony of Hesiod, generated from the foam on the sea after the mutilation of Uranos ; nor if in the Odyssey she appears as the wife of Hêphæstos, while in the Theogony the latter is married to Aglaia, and Aphroditê is described as mother of three children by Arê. ¹ The Homeric Hymn to Aphroditê details the legend of Aphroditê and Anchisê, which is presupposed in the Iliad as the parentage of Æneas : but the author of the Hymn, probably sung at one of the festivals of Aphroditê in Cyprus, represents the goddess as ashamed of her passion for a mortal, and as enjoining Anchisê under severe menaces not to reveal who the mother of Æneas was ; ² while in the Iliad she has no scruple in publicly owning him, and he passes everywhere as her acknowledged son. Aphroditê is described in the Hymn as herself cold and unimpressible, but ever active and irresistible in inspiring amorous feelings to gods, to men, and to animals. Three goddesses are recorded as memorable exceptions to her universal empire,—Athénê, Artemis, and Hestia or Vesta. Aphroditê was one of the most important of all the goddesses in the mythical world : for the number of interesting, pathetic and tragical adventures deducible from misplaced or unhappy passion was of course very great ; and in most of these cases the intervention of Aphroditê was usually prefixed, with some legend to explain why she manifested herself. Her range of action grows wider in the later epic and lyric and tragic poets than in Homer. ³

¹ Hesiod, Theogon. 188, 934, 945 ; Homer, Iliad, v. 371 ; Odys. viii. 268.

² Homer, Hymn. Vener. 248, 286 ; Homer, Iliad, v. 320, 386.

³ A large proportion of the Hesiodic epic related to the exploits and adventures of the heroic women,—the Catalogue of Women and the Eoai embodied a string of such narratives. Hesiod and Stesichorus explained the conduct of Helen and Klytaemnestra by the anger of Aphroditê, caused by the neglect of their father Tyndareus to sacrifice to her (Hesiod, Fragm. 59, ed. Duntzer ; Stesichor. Fragm. 9, ed. Schneidewin) : the irresistable ascendancy of Aphroditê is set forth in the Hippolytus of Euripidês not less forcibly than that of Dionysos in the Bacchæ. The character of Daphnis the herdsman, well known from the first Idyll of Theocritus, and illustrating the destroying force of Aphroditê, appears to have been first introduced into Greek poetry by Stesichorus (see Klausen, Æneas und die Penaten, vol. i. pp. 526-529 : compare Welcker, Kleine Schriften, part i. p. 189). Compare a striking piece among the Fragmenta Incerta of Sophoklês (Fr. 63, Brunck) and Euripid. Troad. 946, 995, 1048. Even in the Opp. et Di. of Hesiod, Aphroditê is conceived rather as a disturbing and injurious influence (v. 65).

Adonis owes his renown to the Alexandrine poets and their contemporary sovereigns (see Bion's Idyll and the Adoniazusæ of Theocritus). The

Athénê, the man-goddess,¹ born from the head of Zeus, without a mother and without feminine sympathies, is the antithesis partly of Aphroditê, partly of the effeminate or womanised god Dionysos—the latter is an importation from Asia, but Athénê is a Greek conception—the type of composed, majestic and unrelenting force. It appears however as if this goddess had been conceived in a different manner in different parts of Greece. For we find ascribed to her in some of the legends, attributes of industry and home-keeping; she is represented as the companion of Héphæstos, patronising handicraft, and expert at the loom and the spindle: the Athenian potters worshipped her along with Prométheus. Such traits of character do not square with the formidable ægis and the massive and crushing spear which Homer and most of the mythes assign to her. There probably were at first at least two different types of Athénê, and their coalescence has partially obliterated the less marked of the two.² Athénê is the constant and watchful protectress of Héraklês: she is also locally identified with the soil and people of Athens, even in the Iliad: Erechtheus, the Athenian, is born of the earth, but Athénê brings him up, nourishes him, and lodges him in her own temple, where the Athenians annually worship him with sacrifice and solemnities.³ It was altogether impossible to make Erechtheus son of Athénê,—the type of the goddess forbade it; but the Athenian mythe-creators, though they found this barrier impassable, strove to approach to it as near as they could, and the description which they give of the birth of Ericthonios, at once un-Homeric and unseemly, presents something like the phantom of maternity.⁴

The huntress Artemis, in Arcadia and in Greece proper, generally exhibits a well-defined type with which the legends favourites of Aphroditê, even as counted up by the diligence of Clemens Alexandrinus, are however very few in number. (Admonitio ad Gent. p. 12, Sylb.)

¹ Ἀνδροθέα δῶρον . . . Ἀθάνα Simmias Rhodius; Πέλεκυς, ap. Hephaestion. c. 9, p. 54, Gaisford.

² Apollodör. ap. Schol. ad Sophokl. (Edip. vol. 57; Pausan. i. 24, 3; ix. 26, 3; Diodör. v. 73; Plato, Legg. ix. p. 920. In the Opp. et Li. of Hesiod, the carpenter is the servant of Athénê (429): see also Phereklos the τέκτων in the Iliad, v. 61: compare viii. 385; Odyss. viii. 493; and the Homeric Hymn to Aphroditê, v. 12. The learned article of O. Müller (in the Encyclopædia of Ersch and Gruber, since republished among his Kleine Deutsche Schriften, p. 134 seq.), *Pallas Athénê*, brings together all that can be known about this goddess.

³ Iliad, ii. 546; viii. 362.

⁴ Apollodör. iii. 4, 6. Compare the vague language of Plato, Kritias, c. iv., and Ovid, Metamorph. ii. 757.

respecting her are tolerably consistent. But the Ephesian as well as the Tauric Artemis partakes more of the Asiatic character, and has borrowed the attributes of the Lydian Great Mother as well as of an indigenous Tauric Virgin:¹ this Ephesian Artemis passed to the colonies of Phokæa and Milétus.² The Homeric Artemis shares with her brother Apollo in the dexterous use of the far-striking bow, and sudden death is described by the poet as inflicted by her gentle arrow. Jealousy of the gods at the withholding of honours and sacrifices, or at the presumption of mortals in contending with them,—a point of character so frequently recurring in the types of the Grecian gods,—manifests itself in the legends of Artemis. The memorable Kalydônian boar is sent by her as a visitation upon Æneus, because he had omitted to sacrifice to her, while he did honour to other gods.³ The Arcadian heroine Atalanta is however a reproduction of Artemis, with little or no difference, and the goddess is sometimes confounded even with her attendant nymphs.

The mighty Poseidôn, the earth-shaker and the ruler of the sea, is second only to Zeus in power, but has no share in those imperial and superintending capacities which the Father of Gods and men exhibits. He numbers a numerous heroic progeny, usually men of great corporeal strength, and many of them belonging to the Æolic race. The great Neleid family of Pylus trace their origin up to him; and he is also the father of Polyphémus the Cyclôps, whose well-earned suffering he cruelly revenges upon Odysseus. His Delós is the island of Kalaureia,⁴ wherein there was held an old local Amphiktyony, for the purpose of rendering to him joint honour and sacrifice. The isthmus of Corinth, Helikê in Achaia, and Onchêstos in

¹ Herodot. iv. 103; Strabo, xii. p. 534; xiii. p. 650. About the Ephesian Artemis, see Guhl, *Ephesiaca* (Berlin, 1843), p. 79 sqq.; Aristoph. Nub. 590; Autokratés in *Tympanistis* apud Älian. Hist. Animal. xii. 9; and Spanheim ad Callimach. Hymn. Dian. 36. The dances in honour of Artemis sometimes appear to have approached to the frenzied style of Bacchanal movement. See the words of Timotheus ap. Plutarch. de Audiend. Poet. p. 22, c. 4, and περὶ Δειποδ. c. 10, p. 170, also Aristoph. Lysist. 1314. They seem to have been often celebrated in the solitudes of the mountains, which were the favourite resort of Artemis (Callimach. Hymn. Dian. 19), and these δρειβάσιαι were always causes predisposing to fanatical excitement.

² Strabo, iv. p. 179.

³ Iliad, ix. 529.

⁴ Strabo, viii. p. 374. According to the old poem called *Eumolpia*, ascribed to Museus, the oracle of Delphi originally belonged to Poseidôn and Gæa, jointly: from Gæa it passed to Themis, and from her to Apollo, to whom Poseidôn also made over his share as a compensation for the surrender of Kalaureia to him. (Pausan. x. 5, 3.)

Boeotia, are also residences which he much affects, and where he is solemnly worshipped. But the abode which he originally and specially selected for himself was the Acropolis of Athens, where by a blow of his trident he produced a well of water in the rock: Athénê came afterwards and claimed the spot for herself, planting in token of possession the olive-tree which stood in the sacred grove of Pandrosos: and the decision either of the autochthonous Cecrops, or of Erechtheus, awarded to her the preference, much to the displeasure of Poseidôn. Either on this account, or on account of the death of his son Eumolpus, slain in assisting the Eleusinians against Erechtheus, the Attic mythes ascribed to Poseidôn great enmity against the Erechtheid family, which he is asserted to have ultimately overthrown: Theseus, whose glorious reign and deeds succeeded to that family, is said to have been really his son.¹ In several other places,—in Ægina, Argos and Naxos,—Poseidôn had disputed the privileges of patron-god with Zeus, Hérê and Dionysos: he was worsted in all, but bore his defeat patiently.² Poseidôn endured a long slavery, in common with Apollo, gods as they were,³ under Laomedôn, king of Troy, at the command and condemnation of Zeus: the two gods rebuilt the walls of the city, which had been destroyed by Héraklês. When their time was expired, the insolent Laomedôn withheld from them the stipulated reward, and even accompanied its refusal with appalling threats; and the subsequent animosity of the god against Troy was greatly determined by the sentiment of this injustice.⁴

Such periods of servitude, inflicted upon individual gods, are among the most remarkable of all the incidents in the divine legends. We find Apollo on another occasion condemned to serve Admêtus, king of Pheræ, as a punishment for having killed the Cyclôpes, and Héraklês also is sold as a slave to Omphalê. Even the fierce Arês, overpowered and imprisoned for a long time by the two Alôids,⁵ is ultimately liberated only by extraneous aid. Such narratives attest the discursive range of Grecian fancy in reference to the gods, as well as the perfect commingling of things and persons, divine and human, in their conceptions of the past. The god who serves is for the time degraded: but the supreme god who commands the

¹ *Apollodôr.* iii. 14, 1; iii. 15, 3, 5.

² *Plutarch, Sympos.* viii. 6, p. 741.

³ *Iliad.* ii. 716, 766; *Euripid. Alkestis.* 2. See *Panyasis, Fragm.* 12, p. 24, ed. Dünzter.

⁴ *Iliad,* vii. 452; xxi. 459.

⁵ *Iliad,* v. 386.

servitude is in the like proportion exalted, whilst the idea of some sort of order and government among these superhuman beings was never lost sight of. Nevertheless the mythes respecting the servitude of the gods became obnoxious afterwards, along with many others, to severe criticism on the part of philosophers.

The proud, jealous, and bitter Hérê,—the goddess of the once-wealthy Mykênae, the *fax et focus* of the Trojan war, and the ever-present protectress of Jasôn in the Argonautic expedition,¹—occupies an indispensable station in the mythical world. As the daughter of Kronos and wife of Zeus, she fills a throne from whence he cannot dislodge her, and which gives her a right perpetually to grumble and to thwart him.² Her unmeasured jealousy of the female favourites of Zeus, and her antipathy against his sons, especially against Héraklês, has been the suggesting cause of innumerable mythes: the general type of her character stands here clearly marked, as furnishing both stimulus and guide to the mythopœic fancy. The “Sacred Wedding,” or marriage of Zeus and Hérê, was familiar to epithalamic poets long before it became a theme for the spiritualising ingenuity of critics.

Héphæstos is the son of Hérê without a father, and stands to her in the same relation as Athénê to Zeus: her pride and want of sympathy are manifested by her casting him out at once in consequence of his deformity.³ He is the god of fire—especially of fire in its practical applications to handicraft—and is indispensable as the right hand and instrument of the gods. His skill and his deformity appear alternately as the source of mythical stories: wherever exquisite and effective fabrication is intended to be designated, Héphæstos is announced as the maker, although in this function the type of his character is reproduced in Dædalos. In the Attic legends he appears intimately united both with Prométheus and with Athénê, in conjunction with whom he was worshipped at Kolonus near Athens. Lémnos was the favourite residence of Héphæstos; and if we possessed more knowledge of this island and its town Héphæstias, we should doubtless find abundant legends detailing his adventures and interventions.

The chaste, still, and home-keeping Hestia, goddess of the family hearth, is far less fruitful in mythical narratives, in spite of her very superior dignity, than the knavish, smooth-tongued, keen and acquisitive Hermès. His function of messenger of

¹ Iliad, iv. 51; Odyss. xii. 72.

² Iliad, i. 544; iv. 29-38; viii. 408.

³ Iliad, xviii. 306.

the gods brings him perpetually on the stage, and affords ample scope for portraying the features of his character. The Homeric Hymn to Hermès describes the scene and circumstances of his birth, and the almost instantaneous manifestation, even in infancy, of his peculiar attributes. It explains the friendly footing on which he stood with Apollo,—the interchange of gifts and functions between them,—and lastly, the inviolate security of all the wealth and offerings in the Delphian temple, exposed as they were to thieves without any visible protection. Such was the innate cleverness and talent of Hermès, that on the day he was born he invented the lyre, stringing the seven chords on the shell of a tortoise¹—and also stole the cattle of Apollo in Pieria, dragging them backwards to his cave in Arcadia, so that their track could not be detected. To the remonstrances of his mother Maia, who points out to him the danger of offending Apollo, Hermès replies, that he aspires to rival the dignity and functions of Apollo among the immortals, and that if his father Zeus refuses to grant them to him, he will employ his powers of thieving in breaking open the sanctuary at Delphi, and in carrying away the gold and the vestments, the precious tripods and vessels.² Presently Apollo discovers the loss of his cattle, and after some trouble finds his way to the Kyllénian cavern, where he sees Hermès asleep in his cradle. The child denies the theft with effrontery, and even treats the surmise as a ridiculous impossibility: he persists in such denial even before Zeus, who however detects him at once, and compels him to reveal the place where the cattle are concealed. But the lyre was as yet unknown to Apollo, who has heard nothing except the voice of the Muses and the sound of the pipe. So powerfully is he fascinated by hearing the tones of the lyre from Hermès, and so eager to become possessed of it, that he is willing at once to pardon the past theft, and even to conciliate besides the friendship of Hermès.³ Accordingly a bargain is struck between the two gods and sanctioned by Zeus. Hermès surrenders to Apollo the lyre, inventing for his own

¹ Homer, Hymn. Mercur. 18—

'Ηώδης γεγονώς, μέσω ήματι ἐγκιθάριζεν,
'Εσπέριος βους κλέψεν ἐκηβόλους 'Απόλλωνος, &c.

² Homer, Hymn. Merc. 177—

Ἐιμὶ γὰρ ἐς Πύθωνα, μέγαν δόμον ἀντιτορήσων,
Ἐνθεν ἀλις τριπόδας περικαλλέας, ἡδὲ λέβητας
Πορθήσω καὶ χρυσὸν, &c.

³ Homer, Hymn. Merc. 442-454.

use the syrinx or panpipe, and receiving from Apollo in exchange the golden rod of wealth, with empire over flocks and herds as well as over horses and oxen and the wild animals of the woods. He presses to obtain the gift of prophecy, but Apollo is under a special vow not to impart that privilege to any god whatever. He instructs Hermès however how to draw information, to a certain extent, from the Mœræ or Fates themselves ; and assigns to him, over and above, the function of messenger of the gods to Hadès.

Although Apollo has acquired the lyre, the particular object of his wishes, he is still under apprehension that Hermès will steal it away from him again, together with his bow, and he exacts a formal oath by Styx as security. Hermès promises solemnly that he will steal none of the acquisitions, nor ever invade the sanctuary of Apollo ; while the latter on his part pledges himself to recognise Hermès as his chosen friend and companion, amongst all the other sons of Zeus, human or divine.¹

So came to pass, under the sanction of Zeus, the marked favour shown by Apollo to Hermès. But Hermès (concludes the hymnographer, with frankness unusual in speaking of a god) “does very little good : he avails himself of the darkness of night to cheat without measure the tribes of mortal men.”²

Here the general types of Hermès and Apollo, coupled with the present fact that no thief ever approached the rich and seemingly accessible treasures of Delphi, engender a string of expository incidents ; cast into a quasi-historical form, and detailing how it happened that Hermès had bound himself by especial convention to respect the Delphian temple. The types of Apollo seem to have been different in different times and parts of Greece : in some places he was worshipped as Apollo Nomios,³ or the patron of pasture and cattle ; and this attribute, which elsewhere passed over to his son Aristæus, is

¹ Homer, Hymn. Merc. 504-520—

Καὶ τὸ μὲν Ἐρμῆς
Ἀγροῖδην ἐφίλησε διαμπερὲς, ὡς ἔτι καὶ νῦν, &c.

Καὶ τότε Μαιάδος νιὸς ὑποσχόμενος κατένευσε
Μή ποτ' ἀποκλέψειν, ὃσ' Ἐκῆβολος ἐκτεάτισται,
Μηδέ ποτ' ἐμπελάσειν πυκινῷ δόμῳ αὐτὰρ Ἀπόλλων
Ἀγροῖδης κατένευσεν ἐπ' ἄρβιν καὶ φιλότητι
Μή τινα φίλτερον ἄλλον ἐν ἀβανάτοσιν ἔσεσθαι
Μήτε δέον, μητ' ἄνδρα Διὸς γόνον, &c.

² Homer, Hymn. Merc. 574—

Παῦρα μὲν οὖν ὄνινησι, τὸ δ' ἄκριτον ἡπεροπτεύει
Νύκτα δι' ὄρφναίην φῦλα θυητῶν ἀνθρώπων.

³ Kallimach, Hymn. Apoll. 47.

by our hymnographer voluntarily surrendered to Hermēs, combined with the golden rod of fruitfulness. On the other hand, the lyre did not originally belong to the Far-striking King, nor is he at all an inventor: the hymn explains both its first invention and how it came into his possession. And the value of the incidents is thus partly expository, partly illustrative, as expanding in detail the general preconceived character of the Kyllēnian god.

To Zeus more amours are ascribed than to any of the other gods,—probably because the Grecian kings and chieftains were especially anxious to trace their lineage to the highest and most glorious of all,—each of these amours having its representative progeny on earth.¹ Such subjects were among the most promising and agreeable for the interest of mythical narrative, and Zeus as a lover thus became the father of a great many legends, branching out into innumerable interferences, for which his sons, all of them distinguished individuals, and many of them persecuted by Hérē, furnished the occasion. But besides this, the commanding functions of the Supreme God, judicial and administrative, extending both over gods and men, was a potent stimulus to the mythopœic activity. Zeus has to watch over his own dignity,—the first of all considerations with a god: moreover as Horkios, Xenios, Ktēsios, Meilichios (a small proportion of his thousand surnames), he guaranteed oaths and punished perjurers, he enforced the observance of hospitality, he guarded the family hoard and the crop realised for the year, and he granted expiation to the repentant criminal.² All these different functions created a demand for mythes, as the means of translating a dim, but serious pre-sentiment into distinct form, both self-explaining and communicable to others. In enforcing the sanctity of the oath or of the tie of hospitality, the most powerful of all arguments would be a collection of legends respecting the judgements of Zeus, Horkios or Xenios; the more impressive and terrific such legends were, the greater would be their interest, and the less would any one dare to disbelieve them. They constituted the natural outpourings of a strong and common sentiment, probably without any deliberate ethi-
tions of the divine agency, e-
product analogous to the ide-
symmetry embodied in the br-

¹ Kallimach. Hymn. Jov. 79. 'Εκ

² See Herodot. i. 44. Xenoph. A

But it was not alone the general type and attributes of the gods which contributed to put in action the mythopoeic propensities. The rites and solemnities forming the worship of each god, as well as the details of his temple and its locality, were a fertile source of mythes, respecting his exploits and sufferings, which to the people who heard them served the purpose of past history. The exegetes, or local guide and interpreter, belonging to each temple, preserved and recounted to curious strangers these traditional narratives, which lent a certain dignity even to the minutiae of divine service. Out of a stock of materials thus ample, the poets extracted individual collections, such as the "Causes" (*Aitia*) of Kallimachus, now lost, and such as the Fasti of Ovid are for the Roman religious antiquities.¹

It was the practice to offer to the gods in sacrifice the bones of the victim only, enclosed in fat: how did this practice arise? The author of the Hesiodic Theogony has a story which explains it: Prométheus tricked Zeus into an imprudent choice, at the period when the gods and mortal men first came to an arrangement about privileges and duties (in *Mekônê*). Prométheus, the tutelary representative of man, divided a large steer into two portions: on the one side he placed the flesh and guts, folded up in the omentum and covered over with the skin; on the other, he put the bones enveloped in fat. He then invited Zeus to determine which of the two portions the gods would prefer to receive from mankind. Zeus "with both hands" decided for and took the white fat, but was highly incensed on finding that he had got nothing at the bottom except the bones.² Nevertheless the choice of the

¹ Ovid, Fasti, iv. 211, about the festivals of Apollo—

“Prisciique imitamina facti
Ara Deæ comites rauaque terga movent.”

And Lactantius, v. 19, 15. “Ipsos ritus ex rebus gestis (deorum) vel ex casibus vel etiam ex mortibus, natos:” to the same purpose Augustin. De Civ. D. vii. 18; Diodör. iii. 56. Plutarch's Quæstiones Græcæ et Romaicæ are full of similar tales, professing to account for existing customs, many of them religious and liturgic. See Lobeck, *Orphica*, p. 675.

² Hesiod, Theog. 550—

Φῦ ἥρα δολοφρονέων· Ζεῦς δὲ ἄφθιτα μήδεα εἰδώς
Γνῶ ρ' οὐδὲ πρνοίησε δόλον· κακὸ δὲ ὄστεο θυμῷ
Θυγτοῖ ἀνθρωποισ, τὰ καὶ τελέονται ἐμελλεν.
Χεροὶ δὲ ὅγ' ἀμφοτέροισι ἀνειλέτο λευκὸν ἀλειφαρ·
Χωστὸ δὲ φρένας, ἀμφὶ χόλος δέ μιν ἵκετο θυμὸν,
Ὄς οὖτεσ λευκὰ βοῦς δολίη ἐπὶ τέκνη.

In the second line of this citation, the poet tells us that Zeus saw through the trick, and was imposed upon by his own consent, foreknowing that after all, the mischievous consequences of the proceeding would be visited

gods was now irrevocably made: they were not entitled to any portion of the sacrificed animal beyond the bones and the white fat; and the standing practice is thus plausibly explained.¹ I select this as one amongst a thousand instances to illustrate the genesis of legend out of religious practices. In the belief of the people, the event narrated in the legend was the real producing cause of the practice: but when we come to apply a sound criticism, we are compelled to treat the event as existing only in its narrative legend, and the legend itself as having been, in the greater number of cases, engendered by the practice,—thus reversing the supposed order of production.

In dealing with Grecian mythes generally, it is convenient to distribute them into such as belong to the Gods and such as belong to the Heroes, according as the one or the other are the prominent personages. The former class manifest, more palpably than the latter, their real origin as growing out of the faith and the feelings, without any necessary basis, either of matter of fact or allegory: moreover, they elucidate more directly the religion of the Greeks, so important an item in their character as a people. But in point of fact, most of the mythes present to us Gods, Heroes and Men, in juxtaposition one with the other. And the richness of Grecian mythical literature arises from the infinite diversity of combinations thus opened out; first by the three class-types, God, Hero, and Man; next by the strict keeping with which each separate class and character is handled. We shall now follow downward the stream of mythical time, which begins with the Gods, to the Heroic legends, or those which principally concern the Heroes and Heroines; for the latter were to the full as important in legend as the former.

on man. But the last lines, and indeed the whole drift of the legend, imply the contrary of this: Zeus was really taken in, and was in consequence very angry. It is curious to observe how the religious feelings of the poet drive him to save in words the prescience of Zeus, though in doing so he contradicts and nullifies the whole point of the story.

¹ Hesiod, Theog. 557—

'Εκ τοῦ δ' ἀθανάτουσιν ἐπὶ χθονὶ φῦλον ἀνθρώπων
Καίσουσ' ὅστεα λευκὰ θυγειῶν ἐπὶ βωμῶν.

CHAPTER II

LEGENDS RELATING TO HEROES AND MEN

THE Hesiodic theogony gives no account of anything like a creation of man, nor does it seem that such an idea was much entertained in the legendary vein of Grecian imagination; which commonly carried back the present men by successive generations to some primitive ancestor, himself sprung from the soil, or from a neighbouring river, or mountain, or from a god, a nymph, &c. But the poet of the Hesiodic "Works and Days" has given us a narrative conceived in a very different spirit respecting the origin of the human race, more in harmony with the sober and melancholy ethical tone which reigns through that poem.¹

First (he tells us) the Olympic gods made the golden race,—good, perfect, and happy men, who lived from the spontaneous abundance of the earth, in ease and tranquillity like the gods themselves: they suffered neither disease nor old-age, and their death was like a gentle sleep. After death they became, by the award of Zeus, guardian terrestrial dæmons, who watch unseen over the proceedings of mankind—with the regal privilege of dispensing to them wealth, and taking account of good and bad deeds.²

Next, the gods made the silver race,—unlike and greatly inferior, both in mind and body, to the golden. The men of this race were reckless and mischievous towards each other, and disdainful of the immortal gods, to whom they refused to offer either worship or sacrifice. Zeus in his wrath buried

¹ Hesiod, as cited in the *Etymologicon Magnum* (probably the Hesiodic Catalogue of Women, as Marktscheffel considers it, placing it *Frägm. 133*), gives the parentage of a certain *Brotos*, who must probably be intended as the first of men: *Βρότος, ὡς μὲν Εὐήμερος δὲ Μεσσήνιος, ἀπὸ Βρότου τίνος αὐτόχθονος δὲ δε 'Ησίοδος, ἀπὸ Βρότου τοῦ Αἰθέρος καὶ Ήμέρας.*

² *Opp. Di. 120—*

Αὐτάρ ἐπειδὴ τοῦτο γένος κατὰ γαῖα κάλυψε,
Τοι μὲν δαιμονές εἰσι Δίὸς μεγάλου διά βουλάς
Ἐσθλοὶ, ἐπιχθόνιοι, φύλακες θνητῶν ἀνθρώπων.
Οἱ ῥα φυλάσσουσιν τε δίκας καὶ σχέτλια ἔργα,
Ἡέρα ἐστάμενοι, πάντη φοιτῶντες ἐπ' αἰαν
Πλουτούδοται καὶ τούτῳ γέρας βασιλῆϊον ἔσχον.

them in the earth; but there they still enjoy a secondary honour, as the Blest of the under-world.¹

Thirdly, Zeus made the brazen race, quite different from the silver. They were made of hard ash-wood, pugnacious and terrible: they were of immense strength and adamantine soul, neither raising nor touching bread. Their arms, their houses, and their implements were all of brass: there was then no iron. This race, eternally fighting, perished by each other's hands, died out, and descended without name or privilege to Hadēs.²

Next, Zeus made a fourth race, far juster and better than the last preceding. These were the Heroes or demigods, who fought at the sieges of Troy and Thēbes. But this splendid stock also became extinct: some perished in war, others were removed by Zeus to a happier state in the islands of the Blest. There they dwell in peace and comfort, under the government of Kronos, reaping thrice in the year the spontaneous produce of the earth.³

The fifth race, which succeeds to the Heroes, is of iron: it is the race to which the poet himself belongs, and bitterly does he regret it. He finds his contemporaries mischievous, dishonest, unjust, ungrateful, given to perjury, careless both of the ties of consanguinity and of the behests of the gods: Nemesis and *Ædōs* (Ethical Self-reproach) have left earth and gone back to Olympus. How keenly does he wish that his lot had been cast either earlier or later!⁴ This iron race is doomed to continual guilt, care, and suffering, with a small infusion of good; but the time will come when Zeus will put an end to it. The poet does not venture to predict what sort of race will succeed.

Such is the series of distinct races of men, which Hesiod,

¹ Opp. Di. 140—

Αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ καὶ τοῦτο γένος κατὰ γαῖα κάλυψε,
Τοι, μὲν ὑποχθόνιοι μάκαρες θυητοὶ καλέονται
Δεύτεροι, ἀλλ' ἔμπης τιμῇ καὶ τοῖσιν ὀπηδεῖ.

² The ash was the wood out of which spear-handles were made (*Iliad*, xvi. 142): the *Nύμφαι Μελίαι* are born along with the Gigantes and the Erinnyses (*Theogon.* 187),—“gensque virūm truncis et duro robore nata” (*Virgil, Aeneid*, viii. 315),—*hearts of oak*.

³ Opp. Di. 157—

‘Ανδρῶν Ἡρώων θεῖον γένος, οἱ καλέονται
‘Ημιθεοί προτέρη γενεῇ κατ’ ἀπειρονα γαῖαν.

⁴ Opp. Di. 173—

Μηκέτ’ ἐπειτ’ ὥφελον ἔγει πέμπτοισι μετεῖναι
‘Ανδράσιν, ἀλλ’ ἡ πρόσθε θανεῖν, ἡ ἐπειτα γενέσθαι.
Νῦν γάρ δὴ γένος ἔστι σιδήρεον. . . .

or the author of the “Works and Days,” enumerates as having existed down to his own time. I give it as it stands, without placing much confidence in the various explanations which critics have offered. It stands out in more than one respect from the general tone and sentiment of Grecian legend : moreover the sequence of races is neither natural nor homogeneous, —the heroic race not having any metallic denomination, and not occupying any legitimate place in immediate succession to the brazen. Nor is the conception of the dæmons in harmony either with Homer or with the Hesiodic theogony. In Homer, there is scarcely any distinction between gods and dæmons : farther, the gods are stated to go about and visit the cities of men in various disguises for the purpose of inspecting good and evil proceedings.¹ But in the poem now before us, the distinction between gods and dæmons is generic. The latter are invisible tenants of earth, remnants of the once happy golden race whom the Olympic gods first made : the remnants of the second or silver race are not dæmons, nor are they tenants of earth, but they still enjoy an honourable posthumous existence as the Blest of the under-world. Nevertheless the Hesiodic dæmons are in no way authors or abettors of evil ; on the contrary, they form the unseen police of the gods, for the purpose of repressing wicked behaviour in the world.

We may trace, I think, in this quintuple succession of earthly races, set forth by the author of the “Works and Days,” the confluence of two veins of sentiment, not consistent one with the other, yet both co-existing in the author’s mind. The drift of his poem is thoroughly didactic and ethical. Though deeply penetrated with the injustice and suffering which darken the face of human life, he nevertheless strives to maintain, both in himself and in others, a conviction that on the whole the just and laborious man will come off well,² and he enforces

¹ *Odyss.* xvii. 486.

² There are some lines, in which he appears to believe that, under the present wicked and treacherous rulers, it is not the interest of any man to be just (Opp. Di. 270)—

Νῦν δὴ ἔγω μήτ’ αὐτὸς ἐν ἀνθρώποισι δίκαιος
Εἴην, μήτ’ ἐμὸς νιός· ἐπεὶ κακὸν ἔστι δίκαιον
Ἐμμενεῖ, εἰ μείζω γε δίκην ὀδικώτερος ἔξει·
Ἄλλὰ τόδ’ ουπω εὐλα τελεῖν Δία τερπικέραυνον.

On the whole, however, his conviction is to the contrary.

Plutarch rejects the above four lines, seemingly on no other ground than because he thought them immoral and unworthy of Hesiod (see Proclus *ad loc.*). But they fall in perfectly with the temper of the poem ; and the rule of Plutarch is inadmissible, in determining the critical question of what is genuine or spurious.

in considerable detail the lessons of practical prudence and virtue. This ethical sentiment, which dictates his appreciation of the present, also guides his imagination as to the past. It is pleasing to him to bridge over the chasm between the gods and degenerate man, by the supposition of previous races,—the first altogether pure, the second worse than the first, and the third still worse than the second; and to show further how the first race passed by gentle death-sleep into glorious immortality; how the second race was sufficiently wicked to drive Zeus to bury them in the under-world, yet still leaving them a certain measure of honour; while the third was so desperately violent as to perish by its own animosities, without either name or honour of any kind. The conception of the golden race passing after death into good guardian dæmons, which some suppose to have been derived from a comparison with oriental angels, presents itself to the poet partly as approximating this race to the gods, partly as a means of constituting a triple gradation of post-obituary existence, proportioned to the character of each race whilst alive. The denominations of gold and silver, given to the two first races, justify themselves, like those given by Simonidēs of Amorgos and by Phokylidēs to the different characters of women, derived from the dog, the bee, the mare, the ass and other animals; and the epithet of brazen is specially explained by reference to the material which the pugnacious third race so plentifully employed for their arms and other implements.

So far we trace intelligibly enough the moralising vein: we find the revolutions of the past so arranged as to serve partly as an ethical lesson, partly as a suitable preface to the present.¹ But fourth in the list comes “the divine race of Heroes;” and here a new vein of thought is opened by the poet. The symmetry of his ethical past is broken up, in order to make way for these cherished beings of the national faith. For though the author of the “Works and Days” was himself of a didactic

¹ Aratus (*Phænomen.* 107) gives only three successive races,—the golden, silver, and brazen: Ovid superadds to these the iron race (*Metamorph.* i. 89–144); neither of them notice the heroic race.

The observations both of Buttmann (*Mythos der ältesten Menschen-geschlechter*, t. ii. p. 12 of the *Mythologus*) and of Völcker (*Mythologie des Japetischen Geschlechts*, § 6, pp. 250–279) on this series of distinct races are ingenious and may be read with profit. Both recognise the disparate character of the fourth link in the series, and each accounts for it in a different manner. My own view comes nearer to that of Völcker, with some considerable differences; amongst which one is, that he rejects the verses respecting the dæmons which seem to me capital parts of the whole scheme.

cast of thought, like Phokylidēs, or Solōn, or Theognis, yet he had present to his feelings, in common with his countrymen, the picture of Grecian foretime, as it was set forth in the current mythes, and still more in Homer and those other epical productions which were then the only existing literature and history. It was impossible for him to exclude, from his sketch of the past, either the great persons or the glorious exploits which these poems ennobled ; and even if he himself could have consented to such an exclusion, the sketch would have become repulsive to his hearers. But the chiefs who figured before Thêbes and Troy could not be well identified either with the golden, the silver, or the brazen race: moreover it was essential that they should be placed in immediate contiguity with the present race, because their descendants, real or supposed, were the most prominent and conspicuous of existing men. Hence the poet is obliged to assign to them the fourth place in the series, and to interrupt the descending ethical movement in order to interpolate them between the brazen and the iron race, with neither of which they present any analogy. The iron race, to which the poet himself unhappily belongs, is the legitimate successor, not of the heroic, but of the brazen. Instead of the fierce and self-annihilating pugnacity which characterises the latter, the iron race manifests an aggregate of smaller and meaner vices and mischiefs. It will not perish by suicidal extinction—but it is growing worse and worse, and is gradually losing its vigour, so that Zeus will not vouchsafe to preserve much longer such a race upon the earth.

I conceive that the series of races imagined by the poet of the "Works and Days" is the product of two distinct and incongruous veins of imagination,—the didactic or ethical blending with the primitive mythical or epical. His poem is remarkable as the most ancient didactic production of the Greeks, and as one of the first symptoms of a new tone of sentiment finding its way into their literature, never afterwards to become extinct. The tendency of the "Works and Days" is anti-heroic: far from seeking to inspire admiration for adventurous enterprise, the author inculcates the strictest justice, the most unremitting labour and frugality, and a sober, not to say anxious, estimate of all the minute specialties of the future. Prudence and probity are his means,—practical comfort and happiness his end. But he deeply feels, and keenly exposes, the manifold wickedness and shortcomings of his contemporaries, in reference to this capital standard. He

turns with displeasure from the present men, not because they are too feeble to hurl either the spear of Achilles or some vast boundary-stone, but because they are rapacious, knavish, and unprincipled.

The dæmons first introduced into the religious atmosphere of the Grecian world by the author of the "Works and Days,"—as generically different from the gods, but essentially good, and forming the intermediate agents and police between gods and men,—are deserving of attention. They are the seed of a doctrine which afterwards underwent many changes, and became of great importance, first as one of the constituent elements of pagan faith, then as one of the helps to its subversion. It will be recollected that the buried remnants of the half-wicked silver race, though they are not recognised as dæmons, are still considered as having a substantive existence, a name, and dignity, in the under-world. The step was easy, to treat them as dæmons also, but as dæmons of a defective and malignant character: this step was made by Empedoclēs and Xenocratēs, and to a certain extent countenanced by Plato.¹ There came thus to be admitted among the pagan philosophers dæmons both good and bad, in every degree: and these dæmons were found available as a means of explaining many phænomena for which it was not convenient to admit the agency of the gods. They served to relieve the gods from the odium of physical and moral evils, as well as from the necessity of constantly meddling in small affairs. The objectionable ceremonies of the pagan religion were defended upon the ground that in no other way could the exigencies of such malignant beings be appeased. The dæmons were most frequently noticed as causes of evil, and thus the name came insensibly to convey with it a bad sense,—the idea of an evil being as contrasted with the goodness of a god. So it was found by the Christian writers when they commenced their controversy with paganism. One branch of their argument led them to identify the pagan gods with dæmons in the evil sense, and the insensible change in the received meaning of the word lent them a specious assistance. For they could easily show, that not only in Homer, but in the general language of early pagans, all the gods generally were spoken of as dæmons—and therefore, verbally speaking, Clemens and Tatian seemed to affirm nothing more against Zeus or Apollo than was involved in the language of Paganism itself. Yet the audience of Homer or Sophoklēs would have strenuously repudiated the

¹ See this subject further mentioned—*infra*, chap. xvi.

proposition, if it had been put to them in the sense which the word *dæmon* bore in the age and among the circle of these Christian writers.

In the imagination of the author of the "Works and Days," the *dæmons* occupy an important place, and are regarded as being of serious practical efficiency. When he is remonstrating with the rulers around him upon their gross injustice and corruption, he reminds them of the vast number of these immortal servants of Zeus who are perpetually on guard amidst mankind, and through whom the visitations of the gods will descend even upon the most potent evil-doers.¹ His supposition that the *dæmons* were not gods, but departed men of the golden race, allowed him to multiply their number indefinitely, without too much cheapening the divine dignity.

As this poet, enslaved by the current legends, has introduced the heroic race into a series to which they do not legitimately belong—so he has under the same influence inserted in another part of his poem the mythe of Pandôra and Promêtheus,² as a means of explaining the primary diffusion, and actual abundance, of evil among mankind. Yet this mythe can in no way consist with his quintuple scale of distinct races, and is in fact a totally distinct theory to explain the same problem,—the transition of mankind from a supposed state of antecedent happiness to one of present toil and suffering. Such an inconsistency is not a sufficient reason for questioning the genuineness of either passage; for the two stories, though one contradicts the other, both harmonise with that central purpose which governs the author's mind,—a querulous and didactic appreciation of the present. That such was his purpose appears not only from the whole tenor of his poem, but also from the remarkable fact that his own personality, his own adventures and kindred, and his own sufferings figure in it conspicuously. And this introduction of self imparts to it a peculiar interest. The father of Hesiod came over from the Æolic Kymê, with the view of bettering his condition, and settled at Askra in Bœotia, at the foot of Mount Helicon. After his death his two sons divided the family inheritance: but Hesiod bitterly complains that his brother Persês cheated and went to law with him, and obtained through corrupt judges an unjust decision. He farther reproaches his brother with a preference for the suits and unprofitable bustle of the agora, at a time when he ought to be labouring for his subsistence in the field. Askra indeed

¹ Opp. Di. 252. Τρὶς γὰρ μέριοι εἰσιν ἐπὶ χθονὶ πουλυβοτεῖρη, &c.

² Opp. Di. 50-105.

was a miserable place, repulsive both in summer and winter. Hesiod had never crossed the sea, except once from Aulis to Eubœa, whither he went to attend the funeral-games of Amphidamas, the chief of Chalkis : he sung a hymn, and gained as prize a tripod, which he consecrated to the muses in Helicon.¹

These particulars, scanty as they are, possess a peculiar value, as the earliest authentic memorandum respecting the doing or suffering of any actual Greek person. There is no external testimony at all worthy of trust respecting the age of the "Works and Days :" Herodotus treats Hesiod and Homer as belonging to the same age, four hundred years before his own time ; and there are other statements besides, some placing Hesiod at an earlier date than Homer, some at a later. Looking at the internal evidences, we may observe that the pervading sentiment, tone, and purpose of the poem is widely different from that of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, and analogous to what we read respecting the compositions of Archilochus and the Amorgian Simonidēs. The author of the "Works and Days" is indeed a preacher and not a satirist : but with this distinction, we find in him the same predominance of the present and the positive, the same disposition to turn the muse into an exponent of his own personal wrongs, the same employment of Æsopic fable by way of illustration, and the same unfavourable estimate of the female sex,² all of which may be traced in the two poets above-mentioned, placing both of them in contrast with the Homeric epic. Such an internal analogy, in the absence of good testimony, is the best guide which we can follow in determining the date of the "Works and Days," which we should accordingly place shortly after the year 700 B.C. The style of the poem might indeed afford a proof that the ancient and uniform hexameter, though well-adapted to continuous legendary narrative or to solemn hymns, was somewhat monotonous when called upon either to serve a polemical purpose or to impress a striking moral lesson. When poets, then the only existing composers, first began to apply their thoughts to the cut and thrust of actual life, aggressive or didactic, the verse would be seen to require a new, livelier and smarter metre ; and out of

¹ Opp. Di. 630-650, 27-45.

² Compare the fable (*alvos*) in the *Works and Days*, v. 200, with those in Archilochus, Fr. xxxviii. and xxxix., Gaisford, respecting the fox and the ape ; and the legend of Pandōra (v. 95 and v. 705) with the fragment of Simonidēs of Amorgos respecting women (Fr. viii. ed. Welcker, v. 95-115) ; also Phokylidēs ap. Stobæum Florileg. lxxi.

Isokratis assimilates the character of the *Works and Days* to that of Theognis and Phokylidēs (ad Nikokl. Or. ii. p. 23).

this want grew the elegiac and the iambic verse, both seemingly contemporaneous, and both intended to supplant the primitive hexameter for the short effusions then coming into vogue.

CHAPTER III

LEGEND OF THE IAPETIDS

THE sons of the Titan god Iapetus, as described in the Hesiodic theogony, are Atlas, Menoëtius, Prométheus, and Epimétheus.¹ Of these, Atlas alone is mentioned by Homer in the *Odyssey*, and even he not as the son of Iapetus: the latter himself is named in the *Iliad* as existing in Tartarus along with Kronos. The Homeric Atlas “knows the depths of the whole sea, and keeps by himself those tall pillars which hold the heaven apart from the earth.”²

As the Homeric theogony generally appears much expanded in Hesiod, so also does the family of Iapetus, with their varied adventures. Atlas is here described, not as the keeper of the intermediate pillars between heaven and earth, but as himself condemned by Zeus to support the heaven on his head and hands;³ while the fierce Menoëtius is pushed down to Erebus as a punishment for his ungovernable insolence. But the remaining two brothers, Prométheus and Epimétheus, are among the most interesting creations of Grecian legend, and distinguished in more than one respect from all the remainder.

First, the main battle between Zeus and the Titan gods is a contest of force purely and simply—mountains are hurled and thunder is launched, and the victory remains to the strongest. But the competition between Zeus and Prométheus is one of craft and stratagem: the victory does indeed remain to the former, but the honours of the fight belong to the latter. Secondly, Prométheus and Epimétheus (the fore-thinker and

¹ Hesiod, *Theog.* 510.

² Hom. *Odyss.* i. 120—

Ἄτλαντος θυγάτηρ ὀλούφρονος, ὡστε θαλάσσης
Πάσης θίνθεα οἴδε, ἔχει δέ τε κίονας αὐτὸς
Μακράς, αἱ γαῖαν τε καὶ οὐρανὸν ἀμφὶς ἔχουσιν.

³ Hesiod, *Theog.* 516—

Ἄτλας δὲ οὐρανὸν εύρυν ἔχει κρατερῆς ὑπ' ἀνάγκης
Ἐστηώς, κεφαλῆς τε καὶ ἀκαμάτοις χέρεσσι.

Hesiod stretches far beyond the simplicity of the Homeric conception.

the after-thinker¹) are characters stamped at the same mint, and by the same effort, the express contrast and antithesis of each other. Thirdly, mankind are here expressly brought forward, not indeed as active partners in the struggle, but as the grand and capital subjects interested,—as gainers or sufferers by the result. Prométheus appears in the exalted character of champion of the human race, even against the formidable superiority of Zeus.

In the primitive or Hesiodic legend, Prométheus is not the creator or moulder of man; it is only the later additions which invest him with this character.² The race are supposed as existing, and Prométheus, a member of the dispossessed body of Titan gods, comes forward as their representative and defender. The advantageous bargain which he made with Zeus on their behalf, in respect to the partition of the sacrificial animals, has been recounted in a preceding chapter. Zeus felt that he had been outwitted, and was exceeding wroth. In his displeasure he withheld from mankind the inestimable comfort of fire, so that the race would have perished, had not Prométheus stolen fire, in defiance of the Supreme Ruler, and brought it to men in the hollow stem of the plant called giant-fennel.³

Zeus was now doubly indignant, and determined to play off a still more ruinous stratagem. Héphæstos, by his direction, moulded the form of a beautiful virgin; Athénè dressed her, Aphroditē and the Charites bestowed upon her both ornament and fascination, while Hermēs infused into her the mind of a dog, a deceitful spirit, and treacherous words.⁴ The messenger of the gods conducted this “fascinating mischief” to mankind, at a time when Prométheus was not present. Now Epimétheus had received from his brother peremptory injunctions not to accept from the hands of Zeus any present whatever; but the beauty of Pandôra (so the newly-formed female was called) was not to be resisted. She was received and admitted among men, and from that moment their comfort and tranquillity was

¹ Pindar extends the family of Epimétheus and gives him a daughter, Πρόφατις (Pyth. v. 25), *Excuse*, the offspring of Aſter-thought.

² Apollodôr. i. 7, 1. Nor is he such either in Aeschylus, or in the Platonic fable (Protаг. c. 30), though this version became at last the most popular. Some hardened lumps of clay, remnants of that which had been employed by Prométheus in moulding man, were shown to Pausanias at Panopeus in Phokis (Paus. x. 4, 3).

The first Epigram of Erinna (Anthol. i. p. 58, ed. Brunck) seems to allude to Prométheus as moulder of man. The expression of Aristophanès (Aves, 689)—πλάσματα πηλοῦ—does not necessarily refer to Prométheus.

³ Hesiod, Theog. 566; Opp. Di. 52.

⁴ Theog. 580; Opp. Di. 50-85.

exchanged for suffering of every kind.¹ The evils to which mankind are liable had been before enclosed in a cask in their own keeping: Pandôra in her malice removed the lid of the cask, and out flew these thousand evils and calamities, to exercise for ever their destroying force. Hope alone remained imprisoned, and therefore without efficacy, as before—the inviolable lid being replaced before she could escape. Before this incident (says the legend) men had lived without disease or suffering; but now both earth and sea are full of mischiefs. Maladies of every description stalk abroad by day as well as by night,² without any hope for man of relief to come.

The Theogony gives the legend here recounted, with some variations—leaving out the part of Epimêtheus altogether, as well as the cask of evils. Pandôra is the ruin of man, simply as the mother and representative of the female sex.³ And the variations are thus useful, as they enable us to distinguish the essential from the accessory circumstances of the story.

“Thus (says the poet, at the conclusion of his narrative) it is not possible to escape from the purposes of Zeus.”⁴ His mythe, connecting the calamitous condition of man with the malevolence of the supreme god, shows, first, by what cause such an unfriendly feeling was raised; next, by what instrumentality its deadly results were brought about. The

¹ Opp. Di. 81–90.

² Opp. Di. 93. Pandôra does not *bring with her* the cask, as the common version of this story would have us suppose: the cask exists fast closed in the custody of Epimêtheus, or of man himself, and Pandôra commits the fatal treachery of removing the lid. The case is analogous to that of the closed bag of unfavourable winds which Æolus gives into the hands of Odysseus, and which the guilty companions of the latter force open, to the entire ruin of his hopes (Odyss. x. 19–50). The idea of the two casks on the threshold of Zeus, lying ready for dispensation—one full of evils, the other of benefits—is Homeric (Iliad, xxiv. 527)—

Δοῖοι γάρ τε πίθοι κατακείται εν Διὸς οὐδετ., &c.

Plutarch assimilates to this the *πίθος* opened by Pandôra, Consolat. ad Apollon. c. 7, p. 105. The explanation here given of the Hesiodic passage relating to Hope, is drawn from an able article in the Wiener Jahrbucher, vol. 109 (1845), p. 220, by Ritter; a review of Schömann’s translation of the Prométheus of Æschylus. The diseases and evils are inoperative so long as they remain shut up in the cask: the same mischief-making influence which lets them out to their calamitous work, takes care that Hope shall still continue a powerless prisoner in the inside.

³ Theog. 590—

‘Ἐκ τῆς γάρ γένος ἐστὶ γυναικῶν θηλυτεράνων,
Τῆς γάρ ὀλόδοντος ἐστὶ γένος: καὶ φύλα γυναικῶν
Πῆμα μέγα θνητοῖσι μετ’ ἀνδράσι ναετάνοσι, &c.

⁴ Opp. Di. 105—

Οὕτως οὕτι πῆ ἐστὶ Διὸς νόον ἐξαλέασθαι.

human race are not indeed the creation, but the protected flock of Prométheus, one of the elder or dispossessed Titan gods. When Zeus acquires supremacy, mankind along with the rest become subject to him, and are to make the best bargain they can, respecting worship and service to be yielded. By the stratagem of their advocate Prométheus, Zeus is cheated into such a partition of the victims as is eminently unprofitable to him; whereby his wrath is so provoked, that he tries to subtract from man the use of fire. Here however his scheme is frustrated by the theft of Prométheus: but his second attempt is more successful, and he in his turn cheats the unthinking Epimétheus into the acceptance of a present (in spite of the peremptory interdict of Prométheus) by which the whole of man's happiness is wrecked. This legend grows out of two feelings; partly as to the relations of the gods with man, partly as to the relation of the female sex with the male. The present gods are unkind towards man, but the old gods, with whom man's lot was originally cast, were much kinder—and the ablest among them stands forward as the indefatigable protector of the race. Nevertheless, the mere excess of his craft proves the ultimate ruin of the cause which he espouses. He cheats Zeus out of a fair share of the sacrificial victim, so as both to provoke and justify a retaliation which he cannot be always at hand to ward off; the retaliation is, in his absence, consummated by a snare laid for Epimétheus and voluntarily accepted. And thus, though Hesiod ascribes the calamitous condition of man to the malevolence of Zeus, his piety suggests two exculpatory pleas for the latter; mankind have been the first to defraud Zeus of his legitimate share of the sacrifice—and they have moreover been consenting parties to their own ruin. Such are the feelings, as to the relation between the gods and man, which have been one of the generating elements of this legend. The other element, a conviction of the vast mischief arising to man from women, whom yet they cannot dispense with, is frequently and strongly set forth in several of the Greek poets—by Simonidēs of Amorgos and Phokylidēs, not less than by Euripidēs.

But the miseries arising from woman, however great they might be, did not reach Prométheus himself. For him, the rash champion who had ventured "to compete in sagacity"¹ with Zeus, a different punishment was in store. Bound by heavy chains to a pillar, he remained fast imprisoned for several generations: every day did an eagle prey upon his

¹ Theog. 534. Οὐνεκ' ἐρίζετο θουλὰς ὑπερμενέῃ Κρονίωνι.

liver, and every night did the liver grow afresh for the next day's suffering. At length Zeus, eager to enhance the glory of his favourite son, Héraklēs, permitted the latter to kill the eagle and rescue the captive.¹

Such is the Prométhean mythe as it stands in the Hesiodic poems ; its earliest form, as far as we can trace. Upon it was founded the sublime tragedy of Æschylus, "The Enchained Prométheus," together with at least one more tragedy, now lost, by the same author.² Æschylus has made several important alterations ; describing the human race, not as having once enjoyed and subsequently lost a state of tranquillity and enjoyment, but as originally feeble and wretched. He suppresses both the first trick played off by Prométheus upon Zeus respecting the partition of the victim—and the final formation and sending of Pandôra—which are the two most marked portions of the Hesiodic story ; while on the other hand he brings out prominently and enlarges upon the theft of fire,³ which in Hesiod is but slightly touched. If he has thus relinquished the antique simplicity of the story, he has rendered more than ample compensation by imparting to it a grandeur of *ideal*, a large reach of thought combined with appeals to our earnest and admiring sympathy, and a pregnancy of suggestion in regard to the relations between the gods and man, which soar far above the Hesiodic level—and which render his tragedy the most impressive, though not the most artistically composed, of all Grecian dramatic productions. Prométheus there appears not only as the heroic champion and sufferer in the cause and for the protection of the human race, but also as the gifted teacher of all the arts, helps, and ornaments of life, amongst which fire is only one :⁴ all this against the will and in defiance of the purpose of Zeus, who, on acquiring his empire, wished to destroy the human race and to beget some new breed.⁵ Moreover, new relations between

¹ Theog. 521-532.

² Of the tragedy called *Προμηθεὺς Λυδίμενος* some few fragments yet remain : *Προμηθεὺς Πυρφόρος* was a satyric drama, according to Dindorf : Welcker recognises a third tragedy, *Προμηθεὺς Πυρφόρος*, and a satyric drama, *Προμηθεὺς Πυρκαέν* (Die Griechisch. Tragödien, vol. i. p. 30). The story of Prométheus had also been handled by Sappho in one of her lost songs (Servius ad Virgil. Eclog. vi. 42).

³ Apollodôrus too mentions only the theft of fire (i. 7, 1).

⁴ Æsch. Prom. 442-506—

Πάσαι τέχναι βροτοῖσιν ἐκ Προμηθέως.

⁵ Æsch. Prom. 231—

Βροτῶν δὲ τῶν ταλαιπώρων λόγον
Οὐκ ἔσχεν οὐδέν', ἀλλ' ἀσττώσας γένος
Τὸ πᾶν, ἔχρησεν ἄλλο φιτύσαι νέον.

Promêtus and Zeus are superadded by Æschylus. At the commencement of the struggle between Zeus and the Titan gods, Promêtus had vainly attempted to prevail upon the latter to conduct it with prudence; but when he found that they obstinately declined all wise counsel, and that their ruin was inevitable, he abandoned their cause and joined Zeus. To him and to his advice Zeus owed the victory; yet the monstrous ingratitude and tyranny of the latter is now manifested by nailing him to a rock, for no other crime than because he frustrated the purpose of extinguishing the human race, and furnished to them the means of living with tolerable comfort.¹ The new ruler Zeus, insolent with his victory over the old gods, tramples down all right, and sets at naught sympathy and obligation, as well towards gods as towards man. Yet the prophetic Promêtus, in the midst of intense suffering, is consoled by the foreknowledge that the time will come when Zeus must again send for him, release him, and invoke his aid, as the sole means of averting from himself dangers otherwise insurmountable. The security and means of continuance for mankind have now been placed beyond the reach of Zeus—whom Promêtus proudly defies, glorying in his generous and successful championship,² despite the terrible price which he is doomed to pay for it.

As the Æschylean Promêtus, though retaining the old lineaments, has acquired a new colouring, soul and character, so he has also become identified with a special locality. In Hesiod there is no indication of the place in which he is imprisoned; but Æschylus places it in Scythia,³ and the general belief of the Greeks supposed it to be on Mount Caucasus. So long and so firmly did this belief continue, that the Roman general Pompey, when in command of an army in Kolchis, made with his companion, the literary Greek Theophanê, a special march to view the spot in Caucasus where Promêtus had been transfixed.⁴

¹ Æsch. Prom. 198-222, 123—

διὰ τὴν λίαν φιλότητα βροτῶν.

² Æsch. Prom. 169-770.

³ Prometh. 2. See also the Fragments of the Promêtus Solutus, 177-179, ed. Dindorf, where Caucasus is specially named; but v. 719 of the Promêtus Vinctus seems to imply that Mount Caucasus is a place different from that to which the suffering prisoner is chained.

⁴ Appian, Bell. Mithridat. c. 103.

CHAPTER IV

HEROIC LEGENDS—GENEALOGY OF ARGOS

HAVING briefly enumerated the gods of Greece, with their chief attributes as described in legend, we come to those genealogies which connected them with historical men.

In the retrospective faith of a Greek, the ideas of worship and ancestry coalesced. Every association of men, large or small, in whom there existed a feeling of present union, traced back that union to some common initial progenitor; that progenitor being either the common god whom they worshipped, or some semi-divine person closely allied to him. What the feelings of the community require is, a continuous pedigree to connect them with this respected source of existence, beyond which they do not think of looking back. A series of names, placed in filiation or fraternity, together with a certain number of family or personal adventures ascribed to some of the individuals among them, constitute the ante-historical past through which the Greek looks back to his gods. The names of this genealogy are, to a great degree, gentile or local names familiar to the people,—rivers, mountains, springs, lakes, villages, demes, &c.,—embodied as persons, and introduced as acting or suffering. They are moreover called kings or chiefs, but the existence of a body of subjects surrounding them is tacitly implied rather than distinctly set forth; for their own personal exploits or family proceedings constitute for the most part the whole matter of narrative. And thus the genealogy was made to satisfy at once the appetite of the Greeks for romantic adventure, and their demand for an unbroken line of filiation between themselves and the gods. The eponymous personage, from whom the community derive their name, is sometimes the begotten son of the local god, sometimes an indigenous man sprung from the earth, which is indeed itself divinised.

It will be seen from the mere description of these genealogies that they included elements human and historical, as well as elements divine and extra-historical. And if we could determine the time at which any genealogy was first framed, we should be able to assure ourselves that the men then represented as present, together with their fathers and grandfathers, were real persons of flesh and blood. But this is a point

which can seldom be ascertained ; moreover, even if it could be ascertained, we must at once set it aside, if we wish to look at the genealogy in the point of view of the Greeks. For to them, not only all the members were alike real, but the gods and heroes at the commencement were in a certain sense the most real ; at least, they were the most esteemed and indispensable of all. The value of the genealogy consisted, not in its length, but in its continuity ; not (according to the feeling of modern aristocracy) in the power of setting out a prolonged series of human fathers and grandfathers, but in the sense of ancestral union with the primitive god. And the length of the series is traceable rather to humility, inasmuch as the same person who was gratified with the belief that he was descended from a god in the fifteenth generation, would have accounted it criminal insolence to affirm that a god was his father or grandfather. In presenting to the reader those genealogies which constitute the supposed primitive history of Hellas, I make no pretence to distinguish names real and historical from fictitious creations ; partly because I have no evidence upon which to draw the line, and partly because by attempting it I should altogether depart from the genuine Grecian point of view.

Nor is it possible to do more than exhibit a certain selection of such as were most current and interesting ; for the total number of them which found place in Grecian faith exceeds computation. As a general rule, every deme, every gens, every aggregate of men accustomed to combined action, religious or political, had its own. The small and unimportant demes into which Attica was divided had each its ancestral god and heroes, just as much as the great Athens herself. Even among the villages of Phokis, which Pausanias will hardly permit himself to call towns, deductions of legendary antiquity were not wanting. And it is important to bear in mind, when we are reading the legendary genealogies of Argos, or Sparta, or Thêbes, that these are merely samples amidst an extensive class, all perfectly analogous, and all exhibiting the religious and patriotic retrospect of some fraction of the Hellenic world. They are no more matter of historical tradition than any of the thousand other legendary genealogies which men delighted to recall to memory at the periodical festivals of their gens, their deme, or their village.

With these few prefatory remarks, I proceed to notice the most conspicuous of the Grecian heroic pedigrees, and first, that of Argos.

The earliest name in Argeian antiquity is that of Inachus, the son of Oceanus and Tethys, who gave his name to the river flowing under the walls of the town. According to the chronological computations of those who regarded the mythical genealogies as substantive history, and who allotted a given number of years to each generation, the reign of Inachus was placed 1986 B.C., or about 1100 years prior to the commencement of the recorded Olympiads.¹

The sons of Inachus were Phoroneus and Ægialeus; both of whom however were sometimes represented as autochthonous or indigenous men, the one in the territory of Argos, the other in that of Sikyōn. Ægialeus gave his name to the north-western region of the Peloponnēsus, on the southern coast of the Corinthian Gulf.² The name of Phoroneus was of great celebrity in the Argeian mythical genealogies, and furnished both the title and the subject of the ancient poem called *Phorōnis*, in which he is styled "the father of mortal men."³ He is said to have imparted to mankind, who had before him lived altogether isolated, the first notion and habits of social existence, and even the first knowledge of fire: his dominion extended over the whole Peloponnēsus. His tomb at Argos, and seemingly also the place, called the Phorōnic city, in which he formed the first settlement of mankind, were still shown in the days of Pausanias.⁴ The offspring of Phoroneus, by the nymph Teledikē, were Apis and Niobē. Apis, a harsh ruler, was put to death by Thelxiōn and Telchin, having given to Peloponnēsus the name of Apia: he was succeeded by Argos, the son of his sister Niobē by the god Zeus. From this sovereign Peloponnēsus was denominated Argos. By his wife Evadnē, daughter of Strymōn,⁵ he had four sons, Ekbasus, Peiras, Epidaurus, and Kriasus. Ekbasus was succeeded by his son Agēnōr, and he again by his son Argos Panoptēs,—a very powerful prince, who is said to have had eyes distributed over all his body, and to have liberated Peloponnēsus from several

¹ Apollodōr. ii. 1. Mr. Fynes Clinton does not admit the historical reality of Inachus; but he places Phoroneus seventeen generations, or 570 years prior to the Trojan war, 978 years earlier than the first recorded Olympiad. See *Fasti Hellenici*, vol. iii. c. 1, p. 19.

² Pausan. ii. 5, 4.

³ See Dūntzer, *Fragm. Epic. Græc.* p. 57. The Argeian author Akusilaus, treated Phoroneus as the first of men, *Fragm.* 14. Didot ap. Clem. Alex. *Stromat.* i. p. 321. *Φορωνῆς*, a synonym for Argeians: Theocrit. *Idyll.* xxv. 200.

⁴ Apollodōr. ii. 1, 1; Pausan. ii. 15, 5; 19, 5; 20, 3.

⁵ Apollod. l. c. The mention of Strymōn seems connected with Æschylus, *Suppl.* 255.

monsters and wild animals which infested it:¹ Akusilaus and Æschylus make this Argos an earth-born person, while Pherekydēs reports him as son of Arestōr. Iasus was the son of Argos Panoptēs by Ismēnē, daughter of Asōpus. According to the authors whom Apollodōrus and Pausanias prefer, the celebrated Iō was his daughter: but the Hesiodic epic (as well as Akusilaus) represented her as daughter of Peiras, while Æschylus and Kastor the chronologist affirmed the primitive king Inachus to have been her father.² A favourite theme, as well for the ancient genealogical poets as for the Attic tragedians, were the adventures of Iō; of whom, while priestess of Hérē, at the ancient and renowned Héræon between Mykēnæ and Tiryns, Zeus became amorous. When Hérē discovered the intrigue and taxed him with it, he denied the charge, and metamorphosed Iō into a white cow. Hérē, requiring that the cow should be surrendered to her, placed her under the keeping of Argos Panoptēs; but this guardian was slain by Hermēs, at the command of Zeus; and Hérē then drove the cow Iō away from her native land by means of the incessant stinging of a gad-fly, which compelled her to wander without repose or sustenance over an immeasurable extent of foreign regions. The wandering Iō gave her name to the Ionian Gulf, traversed Epirus and Illyria, passed the chain of Mount Hæmus and the lofty summits of Caucasus, and swam across the Thracian or Cimmerian Bosphorus (which also from her derived its appellation) into Asia. She then went through Scythia, Cimmeria, and many Asiatic regions, until she arrived in Egypt, where Zeus at length bestowed upon her rest, restored her to her original form, and enabled her to give birth to his black son Epaphos.³

¹ Akusil. Fragm. 17, ed. Didot; Æsch. Prometh. 568; Pherekyd. Fragm. 22, ed. Didot; Hesiod, Ægimias, Fr. 2, p. 56, ed. Dūntzer: among the varieties of the story, one was that Argos was changed into a peacock (Schol. Aristoph. Aves, 102). Macrobius (i. 19) considers Argos as an allegorical expression of the starry heaven; an idea which Panofski also upholds in one of the recent *Abhandlungen* of the Berlin Academy, 1837, p. 121 *seq.*

² Apollod. ii. 1, 1; Pausan. ii. 16, 1; Æsch. Prom. v. 590–663.

³ Æschyl. Prom. v. 790–850; Apollod. ii. 1. Æschylus in the Supplices gives a different version of the wanderings of Iō from that which appears in the Prométheus: in the former drama he carries her through Phrygia, Mysia, Lydia, Pamphylia, and Kilikia into Egypt (Suppl. 544–566): nothing is there said about Prométheus, or Caucasus, or Scythia, &c.

The track set forth in the Supplices is thus geographically intelligible: that in the Prométheus (though the most noticed of the two) defies all comprehension, even as a consistent fiction; nor has the erudition of the

Such is a general sketch of the adventures which the ancient poets, epic, lyric, and tragic, and the logographers after them, connect with the name of the Argeian Iô—one of the numerous tales which the fancy of the Greeks deduced from the amorous dispositions of Zeus and the jealousy of Hêrê. That the scene should be laid in the Argeian territory appears natural, when we recollect that both Argos and Mykénæ were under the special guardianship of Hêrê, and that the Hêraeum near Mykénæ was one of the oldest and most celebrated temples in which she was worshipped. It is useful to compare this amusing fiction with the representation reported to us by Herodotus, and derived by him as well from Phœnician as from Persian antiquarians, of the circumstances which occasioned the transit of Iô from Argos to Egypt,—an event recognised by all of them as historical matter of fact. According to the Persians, a Phœnician vessel had arrived at the port near Argos, freighted with goods intended for sale to the inhabitants of the country. After the vessel had remained a few days, and disposed of most of her cargo, several Argeian women, and among them Iô the king's daughter, coming on board to purchase, were seized and carried off by the crew, who sold Iô in Egypt.¹ The Phœnician antiquarians, however, while they admitted the circumstance that Iô had left her own country in one of their vessels, gave a different colour to the whole by affirming that she emigrated voluntarily, having been engaged in an amour with the captain of the vessel, and fearing that her parents might come to the knowledge of her

commentators been successful in clearing it up. See Schutz, *Excurs. iv. ad Prometh. Vinct.* pp. 144-149; Welcker, *Æschylische Trilogie*, pp. 127-146, and especially Völcker, *Mythische Geographie der Griech. und Römer*, part i. pp. 3-13.

The Greek inhabitants at Tarsus in Kilikia traced their origin to Argos: their story was, that Triptolemus had been sent forth from that town in quest of the wandering Iô, that he had followed her to Tyre, and then renounced the search in despair. He and his companions then settled partly at Tarsus, partly at Antioch (Strabo, xiv. 673; xv. 750). This is the story of Kadmos and Eurôpê inverted, as happens so often with the Grecian mythes.

Homer calls Hermès Ἀργειφόντης; but this epithet hardly affords sufficient proof that he was acquainted with the mythe of Iô, as Völcker supposes: it cannot be traced higher than Hesiod. According to some authors, whom Cicero copies, it was on account of the murder of Argos that Hermès was obliged to leave Greece and go into Egypt; then it was that he taught the Egyptians laws and letters (*De Natur. Deor. iii. 22*).

¹ The story in Parthénias (*Narrat. I*) is built upon this version of Iô's adventures.

pregnancy. Both Persians and Phœnicians described the abduction of Iô as the first of a series of similar acts between Greeks and Asiatics, committed each in revenge for the preceding. First came the rape of Eurôpê from Phœnicia by Grecian adventurers,—perhaps, as Herodotus supposed, by Krêtans: next, the abduction of Médeia from Kolchis by Jasôn, which occasioned the retaliatory act of Paris, when he stole away Helena from Menelaos. Up to this point the seizures of women by Greeks from Asiatics, and by Asiatics from Greeks, had been equivalent both in number and in wrong. But the Greeks now thought fit to equip a vast conjoint expedition to recover Helen, in the course of which they took and sacked Troy. The invasions of Greece by Darius and Xerxes were intended, according to the Persian antiquarians, as a long-delayed retribution for the injury inflicted on the Asiatics by Agamemnôn and his followers.¹

The account thus given of the adventures of Iô, when contrasted with the genuine legend, is interesting, as it tends to illustrate the phænomenon which early Grecian history is constantly presenting to us,—the way in which the epical furniture of an unknown past is recast and newly coloured so as to meet those changes which take place in the retrospective feelings of the present. The religious and poetical character of the whole legend disappears: nothing remains except the names of persons and places, and the voyage from Argos to Egypt: we have in exchange a sober, quasi-historical narrative, the value of which consists in its bearing on the grand contemporary conflicts between Persia and Greece, which filled the imagination of Herodotus and his readers.

To proceed with the genealogy of the kings of Argos, Iasus was succeeded by Krotôpus, son of his brother Agénôr;

¹ Herodot. i. 1-6. Pausanias (ii. 15, 1) will not undertake to determine whether the account given by Herodotus, or that of the old legend, respecting the cause which carried Iô from Argos to Egypt, is the true one: Ephorus (ap. Schol. Apoll. Rhod. ii. 168) repeats the abduction of Iô to Egypt by the Phœnicians, subjoining a strange account of the etymology of the name Bosphorus. The remarks of Plutarch on the narrative of Herodotus are curious: he adduces as one proof of the *κακοήθεια* (bad feeling) of Herodotus, that the latter inserts so discreditable a narrative respecting Iô, daughter of Inachus, “whom all Greeks believe to have been divinised by foreigners, to have given names to seas and straits, and to be the source of the most illustrious regal families.” He also blames Herodotus for rejecting Epaphos, Iô, Iasus, and Argos, as highest members of the Perseid genealogy. He calls Herodotus *φιλοβάρβαρος* (Plutarch, De Malign. Herodoti, c. xi. xii. xiv. pp. 856, 857).

Krotôpus by Sthenelas, and he again by Gelanôr.¹ In the reign of the latter, Danaos came with his fifty daughters from Egypt to Argos; and here we find another of those romantic adventures which so agreeably decorate the barrenness of the mythical genealogies. Danaos and Ægyptos were two brothers descending from Epaphos, son of Iâ: Ægyptos had fifty sons, who were eager to marry the fifty daughters of Danaos, in spite of the strongest repugnance of the latter. To escape such a necessity, Danaos placed his fifty daughters on board of a penteconter (or vessel with fifty oars) and sought refuge at Argos; touching in his voyage at the island of Rhodes, where he erected a statue of Athênê at Lindos, which was long exhibited as a memorial of his passage. Ægyptos and his sons followed them to Argos and still pressed their suit, to which Danaos found himself compelled to assent; but on the wedding night he furnished each of his daughters with a dagger, and enjoined them to murder their husbands during the hour of sleep. His orders were obeyed by all, with the single exception of Hypermnêstra, who preserved her husband Lynkeus, incurring displeasure and punishment from her father. He afterwards, however, pardoned her; and when by the voluntary abdication of Gelanôr, he became king of Argos, Lynkeus was recognised as his son-in-law and ultimately succeeded him. The remaining daughters, having been purified by Athênê and Hermês, were given in marriage to the victors in a gymnic contest publicly proclaimed. From Danaos was derived the name of Danai, applied to the inhabitants of the Argeian territory,² and to the Homeric Greeks generally.

¹ It would be an unprofitable fatigue to enumerate the multiplied and irreconcileable discrepancies in regard to every step of this old Argeian genealogy. Whoever desires to see them brought together may consult Schubart, *Quæstiones in Antiquitatem Heroicam*, Marpurg, 1832, capp. I and 2.

The remarks which Schubart makes (p. 35) upon Petit-Radel's Chronological Tables will be assented to by those who follow the unceasing string of contradictions, without any sufficient reason to believe that any one of them is more worthy of trust than the remainder, which he has cited:—“Videant alii, quomodo genealogias heroicas, et chronologiae rationes, in concordiam redigant. Ipse abstineo, probe persuasus, stemmata vera, historiæ fide comprobata, in systema chronologiæ redigi posse: at ore per sæcula tradita, a poetis reficta, sæpe mutata, prout fabula postulare videbatur, ab historiarum deinde conditoribus restituta, scilicet, brevi, qualia prostant stemmata—chronologiæ secundum annos distributæ vincula semper recusatura esse.”

² Apollod. ii. 1. The Supplices of Æschylus is the commencing drama of a trilogy on this subject of the Danaïdes,—‘Ικέτιδες, Αἰγύπτιοι, Δαναΐδες. Welcker, *Griechisch. Tragödien*, vol. i. p. 48; the two latter are lost.

From the legend of the Danaïdes we pass to two barren names of kings, Lynkeus and his son Abas. The two sons of Abas were Akrisios and Proëtos, who, after much dissension, divided between them the Argeian territory; Akrisios ruling at Argos, and Proëtos at Tiryns. The families of both formed the theme of romantic stories. To pass over for the present the legend of Bellerophôn, and the unrequited passion which the wife of Proëtos conceived for him, we are told that the daughters of Proëtos, beautiful, and solicited in marriage by suitors from all Greece, were smitten with leprosy and driven mad, wandering in unseemly guise throughout Peloponnêsus. The visitation had overtaken them, according to Hesiod, because they refused to take part in the Bacchic rites; according to Pherekydês and the Argeian Akusilaus,¹ because they had treated scornfully the wooden statue and simple equipments of Hérê: the religious character of the old legend here displays itself in a remarkable manner. Unable to cure his daughters, Proëtos invoked the aid of the renowned Pylian prophet and leech, Melampus son of Amythaôn, who undertook to remove the malady on condition of being rewarded with the third part of the kingdom. Proëtos indignantly refused these conditions: but the state of his daughters becoming aggravated and intolerable, he was compelled again to apply to Melampus; who, on the second request, raised his demands still higher, and required another third of the kingdom for his brother Bias. These terms being acceded to, he performed his part of the covenant. He appeased the wrath of Hérê by prayer and sacrifice; or, according to another account, he approached the deranged women at the head of a troop of young men, with shouting and ecstatic dance,—the ceremonies appropriate to the Bacchic worship of Dionysos,—and in this manner effected their cure. Melampus, a name celebrated in many different Grecian mythes, is the legendary founder and progenitor of a great and long-continued family of prophets. He and his brother Bias became kings of separate portions of the Argeian territory: he is recognised as ruler there even in the

The old epic poem called Danaïs or Danaïdes, which is mentioned in the Tabula Iliaca as containing 5,000 verses, has perished, and is, unfortunately, very little alluded to: see Dünzter, Epic. Fragm. p. 3; Welcker, Der Episch. Kyklus, p. 35.

¹ Apollod. l. c.: Pherekyd. ap. Schol. Hom. Odys. xv. 225; Hesiod, Fragm. Marktsch. Fr. 36, 37, 38. These Fragments belong to the Hesiodic Catalogue of Women: Apollodôrus seems to refer to some other of the numerous Hesiodic poems. Diodôrus (iv. 68) assigns the anger of Dionysos as the cause.

Odyssey, and the prophet Theoklymenos, his grandson, is protected and carried to Ithaka by Telemachus.¹ Herodotus also alludes to the cure of the women, and to the double kingdom of Melampus and Bias in the Argeian land: recognising Melampus as the first person who introduced to the knowledge of the Greeks the name and worship of Dionysos, with its appropriate sacrifices and phallic processions. Here again he historicises various features of the old legend in a manner not unworthy of notice.²

But Danaë, the daughter of Akrisios, with her son Perseus, acquired still greater celebrity than her cousins the Proetides. An oracle had apprised Akrisios that his daughter would give birth to a son by whose hand he would himself be slain. To guard against this danger, he imprisoned Danaë in a chamber of brass under ground. But the god Zeus had become amorous of her, and found means to descend through the roof in the form of a shower of gold: the consequence of his visits was the birth of Perseus. When Akrisios discovered that his daughter had given existence to a son, he enclosed both the mother and the child in a coffer, which he cast into the sea.³ The coffer was carried to the isle of Seriphos, where Diktys, brother of the king Polydektēs, fished it up, and rescued both Danaë and Perseus. The exploits of Perseus, when he grew up, against the three Phorkydes or daughters of Phorkys, and the three Gorgons, are among the most marvellous and imaginative in all Grecian legend: they bear a stamp almost Oriental. I shall not here repeat the details of those unparalleled hazards which the special favour of Athénē enabled him to overcome, and which ended in his bringing back from Libya the terrific head of the Gorgon Medusa, endued with the property of turning every one who looked upon it into stone. In his return, he rescued Andromeda, daughter of Kēpheus, who had been exposed to be devoured by a sea-monster, and brought her back as his wife. Akrisios trembled to see him after this

¹ Odyss. xv. 240-256.

² Herod. ix. 34; ii. 49: compare Pausan. ii. 18, 4. Instead of the Proetides, or daughters of Proetos, it is the Argeian women generally whom he represents Melampus as having cured, and the Argeians generally who send to Pylus to invoke his aid: the heroic personality which pervades the primitive story has disappeared.

Kallimachus notices the Proetid virgins as the parties suffering from madness, but he treats Artemis as the healing influence (Hymn. ad Dianam, 235).

³ The beautiful fragment of Simonidēs (Fragm. vii. ed. Gaisford, Poet. Min.), describing Danaë and the child thus exposed, is familiar to every classical reader.

victorious expedition, and retired into Thessaly to avoid him ; but Perseus followed him thither, and having succeeded in calming his apprehensions, became competitor in a gymnic contest where his grandfather was among the spectators. By an incautious swing of his quoit, he unintentionally struck Akrisios, and caused his death : the predictions of the oracle were thus at last fulfilled. Stung with remorse at the catastrophe, and unwilling to return to Argos, which had been the principality of Akrisios, Perseus made an exchange with Megapenthês, son of Prœtos king of Tiryns. Megapenthês became king of Argos, and Perseus of Tiryns : moreover the latter founded, within ten miles of Argos, the far-famed city of Mykênæ. The massive walls of this city, like those of Tiryns, of which a large portion yet remains, were built for him by the Lykian Cyclôpêš.¹

We here reach the commencement of the Perseid dynasty of Mykênæ. It should be noticed, however, that there were among the ancient legends contradictory accounts of the foundation of this city. Both the *Odyssey* and the great *Eoiai* enumerated, among the heroines, Mykênê, the Eponyma of the city ; the former poem classifying her with Tyrô and Alkmênê, the latter describing her as the daughter of Inachus and wife of Arestôr. And Akusilaus mentioned an Eponymus Mykêneus, the son of Spartô and grandson of Phorôneus.²

The prophetic family of Melampus maintained itself in one of the three parts of the divided Argeian kingdom for five generations, down to Amphiaraos and his sons Alkmæôn and Amphilochos. The dynasty of his brother Bias, and that of Megapenthês, son of Prœtos, continued each for four generations : a list of barren names fills up the interval.³ The Perseids of Mykênæ boasted a descent long and glorious, heroic as well as historical, continuing down to the last kings of Sparta.⁴ The issue of Perseus was numerous : his son Alkæos was father of Amphitryôn ; another of his sons, Elektryôn, was father of Alkmênê ;⁵ a third, Sthenelos, father of Eurystheus.

¹ Paus. ii. 15, 4 ; ii. 16, 5. Apollod. ii. 2. Pherekyd. Fragm. 26, Dind.

² *Odyss.* ii. 120. Hesiod, Fragment. 154. Marktscheff.—Akusil. Fragm. 16. Pausan. ii. 16, 4. Hekatæus derived the name of the town from the *μύκης* of the sword of Perseus (Fragm. 360, Dind.). The Schol. ad Eurip. *Orest.* 1247, mentions Mykêneus as son of Spartô, but grandson of Phêgeus the brother of Phorôneus.

³ Pausan. ii. 18, 4.

⁴ Herodot. vi. 53.

⁵ In the Hesiodic Shield of Hêraklês, Alkmênê is distinctly mentioned

After the death of Perseus, Alkæos and Amphitryôn dwelt at Tiryns. The latter became engaged in a quarrel with Elektryôn respecting cattle, and in a fit of passion killed him;¹ moreover the piratical Taphians from the west coast of Akarnania invaded the country, and slew the sons of Elektryôn, so that Alkménê alone was left of that family. She was engaged to wed Amphitryôn; but she bound him by oath not to consummate the marriage until he had avenged upon the Tèleboæ the death of her brothers. Amphitryôn, compelled to flee the country as the murderer of his uncle, took refuge in Thêbes, whither Alkménê accompanied him: Sthenelos was left in possession of Tiryns. The Kadmeians of Thêbes, together with the Lokrians and Phokians, supplied Amphitryôn with troops, which he conducted against the Tèleboæ and the Taphians;² yet he could not have subdued them without the aid of Komæthô, daughter of the Taphian king Pterelaus, who conceived a passion for him, and cut off from her father's head the golden lock to which Poseidôn had attached the gift of immortality.³ Having conquered and expelled his enemies, Amphitryôn returned to Thêbes, impatient to consummate his marriage: but Zeus on the wedding-night assumed his form and visited Alkménê before him: he had determined to produce from her a son superior to all his prior offspring,—“a specimen of invincible force both to gods and men.”⁴ At the proper time, Alkménê was delivered of twin sons: Hêraklês, the offspring of Zeus,—the inferior and unhonoured Iphiklês, offspring of Amphitryôn.⁵

as daughter of Elektryôn: the genealogical poet, Asios, called her the daughter of Amphiaraos and Eriphyle (Asii Fragm. 4, ed. Markt. p. 412). The date of Asios cannot be precisely fixed; but he may be probably assigned to an epoch between the 30th and 40th Olympiad.

Asios must have adopted a totally different legend respecting the birth of Hêraklês and the circumstances preceding it, among which the deaths of her father and brothers are highly influential. Nor could he have accepted the received chronology of the sieges of Thêbes and Troy.

¹ So runs the old legend in the Hesiodic Shield of Hêraklês (12-82). Apollodôrus (or Pherekydês, whom he follows) softens it down, and represents the death of Elektryôn as accidentally caused by Amphitryôn. (Apollod. ii. 4, 6. Pherekydês, Fragm. 27, Dind.)

² Hesiod. Scut. Herc. 24. Theocrit. Idyll. xxiv. 4. Teleboas, the Eponym, of these marauding people, was son of Poseidôn (Anaximander, ap. Athenæ. xi. p. 498).

³ Apollod. ii. 4, 7. Compare the fable of Nisus at Megara, *infra*, chap. xii.

⁴ Hesiod. Scut. Herc. 29. ὅφρα θεῖσιν Ἀνδράσι τ' ἀλφηστῆσιν ἀρῆς ἀλκτῆρα φυτεύσῃ.

⁵ Hesiod. Sc. H. 50-56.

When Alkmēnē was on the point of being delivered at Thêbes, Zeus publicly boasted among the assembled gods, at the instigation of the mischief-making Atê, that there was on that day about to be born on earth, from his breed, a son who should rule over all his neighbours. Hêrê treated this as an empty boast, calling upon him to bind himself by an irremissible oath that the prediction should be realised. Zeus incautiously pledged his solemn word; upon which Hêrê darted swiftly down from Olympus to the Achaic Argos, where the wife of Sthenelos (son of Perseus, and therefore grandson of Zeus) was already seven months gone with child. By the aid of the Eileithyiae, the special goddesses of parturition, she caused Eurystheus, the son of Sthenelos, to be born before his time on that very day, while she retarded the delivery of Alkmênē. Then returning to Olympus, she announced the fact to Zeus: "The good man Eurystheus, son of the Perseid Sthenelos, is this day born of thy loins: the sceptre of the Argeians worthily belongs to him." Zeus was thunderstruck at the consummation which he had improvidently bound himself to accomplish. He seized Atê his evil counsellor by the hair, and hurled her for ever away from Olympus: but he had no power to avert the ascendancy of Eurystheus and the servitude of Hêraklês. "Many a pang did he suffer, when he saw his favourite son going through his degrading toil in the tasks imposed upon him by Eurystheus."¹

The legend, of unquestionable antiquity, here transcribed from the Iliad, is one of the most pregnant and characteristic in the Grecian mythology. It explains, according to the religious ideas familiar to the old epic poets, both the distinguishing attributes and the endless toils and endurances of Hêraklês,—the most renowned and most ubiquitous of all the semi-divine personages worshipped by the Hellênes,—a being of irresistible force, and especially beloved by Zeus, yet condemned constantly to labour for others and to obey the commands of a worthless and cowardly persecutor. His recompense is reserved to the close of his career, when his afflicting trials are brought to a close: he is then admitted to the godhead and receives in marriage Hêbê.² The twelve labours, as they are called, too notorious to be here detailed, form

¹ Homer, Iliad, xix. 90-133; also viii. 361—

Τὴν αἰεὶ στενάχεσχ', ἀθ' ἐδν̄ φίλον νιὸν δρῶτο
Ἐργον ἀεικὲς ἔχοντα, ὑπ' Εὐρυσθῆος ἀέθλων.

² Hesiod, Theogon. 951, τελέσας στονθετας ἀέθλους. Hom. Odyss. xi. 620; Hesiod. Eœæ, Fragm. 24, Duntzer, p. 36, πονηρότατον καὶ κριστον.

a very small fraction of the exploits of this mighty being, which filled the Hérakleian epics of the ancient poets. He is found not only in most parts of Hellas, but throughout all the other regions then known to the Greeks, from Gadès to the river Thermôdôn in the Euxine and to Scythia, overcoming all difficulties and vanquishing all opponents. Distinguished families are everywhere to be traced who bear his patronymic, and glory in the belief that they are his descendants. Among Achæans, Kadmeians, and Dôrians, Héraklês is venerated : the latter especially treat him as their principal hero,—the Patron Hero-God of the race : the Hérakleids form among all Dôrians a privileged gens, in which at Sparta the special lineage of the two kings was included.

His character lends itself to mythes countless in number as well as disparate in their character. The irresistible force remains constant, but it is sometimes applied with reckless violence against friends as well as enemies, sometimes devoted to the relief of the oppressed. The comic writers often brought him out as a coarse and stupid glutton, while the Keian philosopher Prodigos, without at all distorting the type, extracted from it the simple, impressive, and imperishable apologue still known as the Choice of Hercules.

After the death and apotheosis of Héraklês, his son Hyllus and his other children were expelled and persecuted by Eurystheus ; the fear of whose vengeance deterred both the Trachinian king Kêyx and the Thebans from harbouring them. The Athenians alone were generous enough to brave the risk of offering them shelter. Eurystheus invaded Attica, but perished in the attempt by the hand of Hyllus, or by that of Iolaos, the old companion and nephew of Héraklês.¹ The chivalrous courage which the Athenians had on this occasion displayed on behalf of oppressed innocence, was a favourite theme for subsequent eulogy by Attic poets and orators.

All the sons of Eurystheus lost their lives in the battle along with him, so that the Perseid family was now represented only by the Hérakleids, who collected an army and endeavoured to recover the possessions from which they had been expelled. The united forces of Iônians, Achæans, and Arcadians, then inhabiting Peloponnêsus, met the invaders at the isthmus, when Hyllus, the eldest of the sons of Héraklês, proposed that the contest should be determined by a single combat between himself and any champion of the opposing army. It was agreed that if Hyllus were victorious, the Hérakleids should be restored

¹ Apoll. ii. 8, 1 ; Hecatæ. ap. Longin. c. 27 ; Diodôr. iv. 57.

to their possessions—if he were vanquished, that they should forego all claim for the space of a hundred years, or fifty years, or three generations,—for in the specification of the time, accounts differ. Echemos, the hero of Tegea in Arcadia, accepted the challenge, and Hyllus was slain in the encounter; in consequence of which the Hérakleids retired, and resided along with the Dôrians under the protection of Ægimios, son of Dôrus.¹ As soon as the stipulated period of truce had expired, they renewed their attempt upon Peloponnêsus conjointly with the Dôrians, and with complete success: the great Dôrian establishments of Argos, Sparta, and Messênia were the result. The details of this victorious invasion will be hereafter recounted.

Sikyôn, Phlios, Epidauros, and Trœzen² all boasted of respected eponyms and a genealogy of dignified length, not exempt from the usual discrepancies—but all just as much entitled to a place on the tablet of history as the more renowned Æolids or Hérakleids. I omit them here because I wish to impress upon the reader's mind the salient features and character of the legendary world,—not to load his memory with a full list of legendary names.

CHAPTER V

DEUKALION, HELLEN, AND SONS OF HELLEN

IN the Hesiodic Theogony, as well as in the “Works and Days,” the legend of Promêtheus and Epimêtheus presents an import religious, ethical, and social, and in this sense it is carried forward by Æschylus; but to neither of the characters is any genealogical function assigned. The Hesiodic Catalogue of Women brought both of them into the stream of Grecian legendary lineage, representing Deukaliôn as the son of Promêtheus and Pandôra, and seemingly his wife Pyrrha as daughter of Epimêtheus.³

¹ Herodot. ix. 26; Diodôr. iv. 58.

² Pausan. ii. 5, 5; 12, 5; 26, 3. His statements indicate how much the predominance of a powerful neighbour like Argos tended to alter the genealogies of these inferior towns.

³ Schol. ad Apollôn. Rhod. iii. 1085. Other accounts of the genealogy of Deukaliôn are given in the Schol. ad Homer. Odyss. x. 2, on the authority both of Hesiod and Akusilaus.

Deukaliôn is important in Grecian mythical narrative under two points of view. First, he is the person specially saved at the time of the general deluge: next, he is the father of Hellén, the great eponym of the Hellenic race; at least this was the more current story, though there were other statements which made Hellén the son of Zeus.

The name of Deukaliôn is originally connected with the Lokrian towns of Kynos and Opus, and with the race of the Leleges, but he appears finally as settled in Thessaly, and ruling in the portion of that country called Phthiotis.¹ According to what seems to have been the old legendary account, it is the deluge which transferred him from the one to the other; but according to another statement, framed in more historicising times, he conducted a body of Kurêtes and Leleges into Thessaly, and expelled the prior Pelasgian occupants.²

The enormous iniquity with which earth was contaminated—as Apollodôrus says, by the then existing brazen race, or as others say, by the fifty monstrous sons of Lykaôn—provoked Zeus to send a general deluge.³ An unremitting and terrible rain laid the whole of Greece under water, except the highest mountain-tops, whereon a few stragglers found refuge. Deukaliôn was saved in a chest or ark, which he had been fore-

¹ Hesiodic Catalog. Fragm. xi.; Gaisf. lxx. Dünzter—

Ἴητοι γὰρ Δοκρὸς Δελέτων ἡγύσατο λᾶον,
Τούς δὲ πότε Κρονίδης Ζεὺς, ἀφθετα μῆδεα εἰδὼς,
Δεκτοὺς ἐκ γαῖης λᾶας πόρε Δευκαλιώνι.

The reputed lineage of Deukaliôn continued in Phthia down to the time of Dikæarchus, if we may judge from the old Phthiot Pherekratês, whom he introduced in one of his dialogues as a disputant, and whom he expressly announced as a descendant of Deukaliôn (Cicero, *Tuscul.* Disp. i. 10).

² The latter account is given by Dionys. *Halic.* i. 17; the former seems to have been given by Hellanikus, who affirmed that the ark after the deluge stopped upon Mount Othrys, and not upon Mount Parnassus (Schol. Pind. *ut sup.*), the former being suitable for a settlement in Thessaly.

Pyrrha is the eponymous heroine of Pyrrhæa or Pyrrha, the ancient name of a portion of Thessaly (Rhianus, Fragm. 18, p. 71, ed. Dünzter).

Hellanikus had written a work, now lost, entitled *Δευκαλιώνεια*: all the fragments of it which are cited have reference to places in Thessaly, Lokris and Phokis. See Preller, *ad Hellanicum*, p. 12 (Dörpt. 1840). Probably Hellanikus is the main source of the important position occupied by Deukaliôn in Grecian legend. Thrasybulus and Akestodôrus represented Deukaliôn as having founded the oracle of Dôdôna, immediately after the deluge (Etym. Mag. v. *Δωδωναῖος*).

³ Apollodôrus connects this deluge with the wickedness of the brazen race in Hesiod, according to the practice general with the logographers of stringing together a sequence out of legends totally unconnected with each other (i. 7, 2).

warned by his father Prométheus to construct. After floating for nine days on the water, he at length landed on the summit of Mount Parnassus. Zeus having sent Hermès to him, promising to grant whatever he asked, he prayed that men and companions might be sent to him in his solitude: accordingly Zeus directed both him and Pyrrha to cast stones over their heads: those cast by Pyrrha became women, those by Deukaliôn men. And thus the "stony race of men" (if we may be allowed to translate an etymology which the Greek language presents exactly, and which has not been disdained by Hesiod, by Pindar, by Epicharmus, and by Virgil) came to tenant the soil of Greece.¹ Deukaliôn on landing from the ark sacrificed a grateful offering to Zeus Phyxios, or the God of escape; he also erected altars in Thessaly to the twelve great gods of Olympus.²

The reality of this deluge was firmly believed throughout the historical ages of Greece; the chronologers, reckoning up by genealogies, assigned the exact date of it, and placed it at the same time as the conflagration of the world by the rashness of Phaëtôn, during the reign of Krotôpas, king of Argos, the seventh from Inachus.³ The meteorological work of Aristotle admits and reasons upon this deluge as an unquestionable fact, though he alters the locality by placing it west of Mount Pindus, near Dôdôna and the river Achelôus.⁴ He at the

¹ Hesiod, *Fragm.* 135, ed. Markts. ap. *Strabo.* vii. p. 322, where the word λᾶας, proposed by Heyne as the reading of the unintelligible text, appears to me preferable to any of the other suggestions. Pindar, *Olymp.* ix. 47. "Ατερ δ' Εύνᾶς δύδαμον Κτησάσθαν λίθινον γόνον" Λαοὶ δ' ἀνδρασθεν. Virgil, *Georgic.* i. 63. "Unde homines nati, durum genus." Epicharmus ap. Schol. Pindar. *Olymp.* ix. 56, *Hygin.* f. 153. Philochorus retained the etymology, though he gave a totally different fable, nowise connected with Deukaliôn, to account for it; a curious proof how pleasing it was to the fancy of the Greeks (see Schol. ad Pind. l. c. 68).

² Apollod. i. 7, 2. Hellanic. *Fragm.* 15, Didot. Hellanikus affirmed that the ark rested on Mount Othrys, not on Mount Parnassus (*Fragm.* 16. Didot). Servius (ad Virgil. *Eclog.* vi. 41) placed it on Mount Athôs—Hyginus (f. 153) on Mount Ætna.

³ Tatian *adv. Græc.* c. 60, adopted both by Clemens and Eusebius. The Parian marble placed this deluge in the reign of Kranaos at Athens, 752 years before the first recorded Olympiad, and 1528 years before the Christian æra; Apollodôrus also places it in the reign of Kranaos, and in that of Nyctimus in Arcadia (iii. 8, 2; 14, 5).

The deluge and the *ekpyrosis* or conflagration are connected together also in Servius ad Virgil. *Bucol.* vi. 41: he refines both of them into a "mutationem temporum."

⁴ Aristot. *Meteorol.* i. 14. Justin rationalises the fable by telling us that Deukaliôn was king of Thessaly, who provided shelter and protection to the fugitives from the deluge (ii. 6, 11).

same time treats it as a physical phænomenon, the result of periodical cycles in the atmosphere,—thus departing from the religious character of the old legend, which described it as a judgment inflicted by Zeus upon a wicked race. Statements founded upon this event were in circulation throughout Greece even to a very late date. The Megarians affirmed that Megaros, their hero, son of Zeus by a local nymph, had found safety from the waters on the lofty summit of their mountain Geraneia, which had not been completely submerged. And in the magnificent temple of the Olympian Zeus at Athens, a cavity in the earth was shown, through which it was affirmed that the waters of the deluge had retired. Even in the time of Pausanias, the priests poured into this cavity holy offerings of meal and honey.¹ In this, as in other parts of Greece, the idea of the Deukalionian deluge was blended with the religious impressions of the people, and commemorated by their sacred ceremonies.

The offspring of Deukaliôn and Pyrrha were two sons, Hellén and Amphiktyôn, and a daughter, Prôtogeneia, whose son by Zeus was Aëthlius: it was however maintained by many, that Hellén was the son of Zeus and not of Deukaliôn. Hellén had by a nymph three sons, Dôrus, Xuthus, and Æolus. He gave to those who had been before called Greeks,² the name of Hellénes, and partitioned his territory among his three children. Æolus reigned in Thessaly; Xuthus received Peloponnêsus, and had by Kreüsa as his sons, Achæus and Iôn; while Dôrus occupied the country lying opposite to the Peloponnêsus, on the northern side of the Corinthian Gulf. These three gave to the inhabitants of their respective countries the names of Æolians, Achæans and Iônians, and Dôrians.³

Such is the genealogy as we find it in Apollodôrus. In so far as the names and filiation are concerned, many points in it

¹ Pausan. i. 18, 7; 40, 1. According to the Parian marble (s. 5), Deukaliôn had come to Athens after the deluge, and had there himself founded the temple of the Olympian Zeus. The etymology and allegorisation of the names of Deukaliôn and Pyrrha, given by Völcker in his ingenious *Mythologie des Iapetischen Geschlechts* (Giessen, 1824), p. 343, appears to me not at all convincing.

² Such is the statement of Apollodorus (i. 7, 3); but I cannot bring myself to believe that the name (*Γραικοί*) Greeks is at all old in the legend, or that the passage of Hesiod, in which Græcus and Latinus purport to be mentioned, is genuine.

See Hesiod, Theogon. 1013, and Catalog. Fragm. xxix. ed. Göttling, with the note of Göttling; also Wachsmuth, Hellen. Alterth. i. 1. p. 311, and Bernhardy, Griech. Literat. vol. i. p. 167.

³ Apollod. i. 7, 4.

are given differently, or implicitly contradicted, by Euripidēs and other writers. Though as literal and personal history it deserves no notice, its import is both intelligible and comprehensive. It expounds and symbolises the first fraternal aggregation of Hellēnic men, together with their territorial distribution and the institutions which they collectively venerated.

There were two great holding-points in common for every section of Greeks. One was the Amphiktyonic assembly, which met half-yearly, alternately at Delphi and at Thermopylæ; originally and chiefly for common religious purposes, but indirectly and occasionally embracing political and social objects along with them. The other was, the public festivals or games, of which the Olympic came first in importance; next the Pythian, Nemean and Isthmian,—institutions which combined religious solemnities with recreative effusion and hearty sympathies, in a manner so imposing and so unparalleled. Amphiktyôn represents the first of these institutions, and Aëthlius the second. As the Amphiktyonic assembly was always especially connected with Thermopylæ and Thessaly, Amphiktyôn is made the son of the Thessalian Deukaliôn; but as the Olympic festival was nowise locally connected with Deukaliôn, Aëthlius is represented as having Zeus for his father, and as touching Deukaliôn only through the maternal line. It will be seen presently that the only matter predicated respecting Aëthlius is, that he settled in the territory of Elis, and begat Endymiôn: this brings him into local contact with the Olympic games, and his function is then ended.

Having thus got Hellas as an aggregate with its main cementing forces, we march on to its sub-division into parts, through Æolus, Dôrus and Xuthus, the three sons of Hellén;¹ a distribution which is far from being exhaustive: nevertheless, the genealogists whom Apollodôrus follows recognise no more than three sons.

The genealogy is essentially post-Homeric; for Homer knows Hellas and the Hellênes only in connexion with a portion of Achaia Phthiôtis. But as it is recognised in the Hesiodic

¹ How literally and implicitly even the ablest Greeks believed in eponymous persons, such as Hellén and Iôn, as the real progenitors of the races called after him, may be seen by this, that Aristotle gives this common descent as the definition of *γένος* (Metaphysic. iv. p. 118, Brandis)—

Γένος λέγεται, τὸ μὲν . . . τὸ δὲ, ἀφ' οὗ ἀν δοι πρώτου κινήσαντος εἰς τὸ εἶναι. Οὕτω γὰρ λέγονται οἱ μὲν, "Ελλῆνες τὸ γένος, οἱ δὲ, "Ιωνεῖς τῷ, οἱ μὲν ἀπὸ "Ελλήνος, οἱ δὲ ἀπὸ "Ιωνος, εἶναι πρώτου γεννήσαντος.

Catalogue¹—composed probably within the first century after the commencement of recorded Olympiads, or before 676 B.C.—the peculiarities of it, dating from so early a period, deserve much attention. We may remark, first, that it seems to exhibit to us Dôrus and Æolus as the only pure and genuine offspring of Hellén. For their brother Xuthus is not enrolled as an eponymus; he neither founds nor names any people; it is only his sons Achæus and Iôn, after his blood has been mingled with that of the Erechtheid Kreüsa, who become eponyms and founders, each of his own separate people. Next, as to the territorial distribution, Xuthus receives Peloponnesus from his father, and unites himself with Attica (which the author of this genealogy seems to have conceived as originally unconnected with Hellén) by his marriage with the daughter of the indigenous hero Erechtheus. The issue of this marriage, Achæus and Iôn, present to us the population of Peloponnesus and Attica conjointly as related among themselves by the tie of brotherhood, but as one degree more distant both from Dôrians and Æolians. Æolus reigns over the regions about Thessaly, and calls the people in those parts Æolians; while Dôrus occupies “the country over against Peloponnesus on the opposite side of the Corinthian Gulf,” and calls the inhabitants after himself, Dôrians.² It is at once evident that this designation is in no way applicable to the confined district between Parnassus and Cœta, which alone is known by the name of Dôris, and its inhabitants by that of Dôrians, in the historical ages. In the view of the author of this genealogy, the Dôrians are the original occupants of the large range of territory north of the Corinthian Gulf, comprising Ætolia, Phôkis, and the territory of the Ozolian Lokrians. And

¹ Hesiod, *Fragm.* 8. p. 278, ed. Marktsch.—

Ἐλληνος δὲ ἐγένοντο θεμιστοπόλοις βασιλῆες
Δῶρος τε, Σοῦθος τε, καὶ Αἰολος ἵπποιχάρμης.
Αἰολίδαι δὲ ἐγένοντο θεμιστοπόλοις βασιλῆες
Κρητεὺς δὲ Ἀθάμας καὶ Σίνυνθος αἰολομῆτης
Σαλμωνεὺς τέ ἀδίκος καὶ ὑπέρθυμος Πειρήρης.

² Apollod. i. 7, 3. “Ἐλληνος δὲ καὶ Νύμφης Ὀρσήϊδος (?), Δῶρος, Σοῦθος, Αἰολος. Αὐτὸς μὲν οὖν ἀφ' αὐτοῦ τοὺς καλούμενους Γραικοὺς προσηγόρευσεν “Ἐλληνας, τοῖς δὲ παισιν ἐμέρισε τὴν χώραν. Καὶ Σοῦθος μὲν λαβὼν τὴν Πελοπόννησον, ἐκ Κρεούσης τῆς Ἐρεχθέως Ἀχαιὸν ἐγέννησε καὶ “Ιωνα, ἀφ' ἧν Ἀχαιοὶ καὶ Ιωνες καλοῦνται. Δῶρος δὲ, τὴν πέραν χώραν Πελοποννήσου λαβὼν, τοὺς κατοίκους ἀφ' ἐαυτοῦ Δωριεῖς ἐκάλεσεν. Αἰολος δὲ, βασιλεύων τῶν περὶ Θετταλίαν τόπων, τοὺς ἐνοικοῦντας Αἰολεῖς προσηγόρευσε.

Strabo (viii. p. 383) and Conðn (Nar. 27), who evidently copy from the same source, represent Dôrus as going to settle in the territory properly known as Dôris.

this farther harmonises with the other legend noticed by Apollodorus, when he states that *Ætôlus*, son of Endymiôn, having been forced to expatriate from Peloponnêsus, crossed into the Kurêtid territory,¹ and was there hospitably received by Dôrus, Laodokus, and Polypœtës, sons of Apollo and Phthia. He slew his hosts, acquired the territory, and gave to it the name of *Ætôlia*: his son Pleurôn married Xanthippê, daughter of Dôrus; while his other son, Kalydôn, marries *Æolia*, daughter of Amythaôn. Here again we have the name of Dôrus, or the Dôrians, connected with the tract subsequently termed *Ætôlia*. That Dôrus should in one place be called the son of Apollo and Phthia, and in another place the son of Hellêن by a nymph, will surprise no one accustomed to the fluctuating personal nomenclature of these old legends: moreover the name of Phthia is easy to reconcile with that of Hellêن, as both are identified with the same portion of Thessaly, even from the days of the Iliad.

This story, that the Dôrians were at one time the occupants, or the chief occupants, of the range of territory between the river Achelôus and the northern shore of the Corinthian Gulf, is at least more suitable to the facts attested by historical evidence than the legends given in Herodotus, who represents the Dôrians as originally in the Phthiôtid; then as passing under Dôrus, the son of Hellêن, into the Histiæôtid, under the mountains of Ossa and Olympus; next, as driven by the Kadmeians into the regions of Pindus; from thence passing into the Dryopid territory, on Mount Æta; lastly, from thence into Peloponnêsus.² The received story was, that the great Dôrian establishments in Peloponnêsus were formed by invasion from the north, and that the invaders crossed the gulf from Naupaktus,—a statement which, however disputable with respect to Argos, seems highly probable in regard both to Sparta and Messênia. That the name of Dôrians comprehended far more than the inhabitants of the insignificant tetrapolis of Dôris Proper, must be assumed, if we believe that they conquered Sparta and Messênia: both the magnitude of the conquest itself and the passage of a large portion of them from Naupaktus, harmonise with the legend as given by Apollodorus, in which the Dôrians are represented as the principal inhabitants

¹ Apollod. i. 7, 6. Αἰτωλὸς . . . φυγὼν εἰς τὴν Κουρήτιδα χώραν, κτείνας τοὺς ὑποδεξαμένους Φθίλας καὶ Ἀπόλλωνος νιόδις, Δᾶρον καὶ Λαόδοκον καὶ Πολυποίτην, ἀφ' ἑαυτοῦ τὴν χώραν Αἰτωλίαν ἐκάλεσε. Again, i. 8, 1. Πλευρῶν (son of *Ætôlus*) γῆμας Ξανθίππην τὴν Δώρου, παῖδα ἐγένυντος Ἀγήνορα.

² Herod. i. 56.

of the northern shore of the gulf. The statements which we find in Herodotus, respecting the early migrations of the Dôrians, have been considered as possessing greater historical value than those of the fabulist Apollodôrus. But both are equally matter of legend, while the brief indications of the latter seem to be most in harmony with the facts which we afterwards find attested by history.

It has already been mentioned that the genealogy which makes Æolus, Xuthus and Dôrus sons of Hellén, is as old as the Hesiodic Catalogue; probably also that which makes Hellén son of Deukaliôn. Aëthlius also is an Hesiodic personage: whether Amphiktyôn be so or not, we have no proof.¹ They could not have been introduced into the legendary genealogy until after the Olympic games and the Amphiktyonic council had acquired an established and extensive reverence throughout Greece.

Respecting Dôrus the son of Hellén, we find neither legends nor legendary genealogy; respecting Xuthus, very little beyond the tale of Kreüsa and Iôn, which has its place more naturally among the Attic fables. Achæus, however, who is here represented as the son of Xuthus, appears in other stories with very different parentage and accompaniments. According to the statement which we find in Dionysius of Halikarnassus, Achæus, Phthius and Pelasgus are sons of Poseidôn and Larissa. They migrate from Peloponnêsus into Thessaly, and distribute the Thessalian territory between them, giving their names to its principal divisions: their descendants in the sixth generation were driven out of that country by the invasion of Deukaliôn at the head of the Kurêtes and the Leleges.² This was the story of those who wanted to provide an eponymus

¹ Schol. Apollon. Rhod. iv. 57. Τὸν δὲ Ἐνδυμίωνα Ἡσίοδος μὲν Ἀεθλίου τοῦ Δίδος καὶ Καλύκης παιδα λέγει . . . Καὶ Πείσανδρος δὲ τὰ αὐτά φησι, καὶ Ἀκουσίλαος, καὶ Φερεκύδης, καὶ Νίκανδρος ἐν δευτέρῳ Αἰτωλικῶν, καὶ Θεόπομπος ἐν Ἐποτοῖταις.

Respecting the parentage of Hellén, the references to Hesiod are very confused. Compare Schol. Homer. Odys. x. 2, and Schol. Apollon. Rhod. iii. 1086. See also Hellanic. Frag. 10. Didot.

Apollodôrus and Pherekydês before him (Fragm. 51. Didot), called Prôtogeneia daughter of Deukaliôn; Pindar (Olymp. ix. 64) designated her as daughter of Opus. One of the stratagems mentioned by the Scholiast to get rid of this genealogical discrepancy was the supposition that Deukaliôn had two names (*διάνυμος*); that he was also named Opus. (Schol. Pind. Olymp. ix. 85.)

That the Deukalidæ or posterity of Deukaliôn reigned in Thessaly, was mentioned both by Hesiod and Hekatæus, ap. Schol. Apollon. Rhod. iv. 265.

² Dionys. H. A. R. i. 17.

for the Achæans in the southern districts of Thessaly: Pausanias accomplishes the same object by different means, representing Achæus the son of Xuthus as having gone back to Thessaly and occupied the portion of it to which his father was entitled. Then, by way of explaining how it was that there were Achæans at Sparta and at Argos, he tells us that Archander and Architelēs the sons of Achæus, came back from Thessaly to Peloponnēsus, and married two daughters of Danaus; they acquired great influence at Argos and Sparta, and gave to the people the name of Achæans after their father Achæus.¹

Euripidēs also deviates very materially from the Hesiodic genealogy in respect to these eponymous persons. In the drama called *Iōn*, he describes Iōn as son of Kreüsa by Apollo, but adopted by Xuthus; according to him, the real sons of Xuthus and Kreüsa are Dōrus and Achæus,²—eponyms of the Dōrians and Achæans in the interior of Peloponnēsus. And it is a still more capital point of difference that he omits Hellēn altogether—making Xuthus an Achæan by race, the son of Æolus, who is the son of Zeus.³ This is the more remarkable, as in the fragments of two other dramas of Euripidēs, the *Melanippē* and the *Æolus*, we find Hellēn mentioned both as father of Æolus and son of Zeus.⁴ To the general public even of the most instructed city of Greece, fluctuations and discrepancies in these mythical genealogies seem to have been neither surprising nor offensive.

¹ Pausan. vii. 1, 1-3. Herodotus also mentions (ii. 97) Archander, son of Phthius and grandson of Achæus, who married the daughter of Danaus. Larcher (*Essai sur la Chronologie d'Hérodote*, ch. x. p. 321) tells us that this cannot be the Danaus who came from Egypt, the father of the fifty daughters, who must have lived two centuries earlier, as may be proved by chronological arguments: this must be another Danaus, according to him.

Strabo seems to give a different story respecting the Achæans in Peloponnēsus: he says that they were the original population of the peninsula, that they came in from Phthia with Pelops, and inhabited Laconia, which was from them called Argos Achaicum, and that on the conquest of the Dōrians, they moved into Achaia properly so called, expelling the Ionians therefrom (Strabo, viii. p. 365). This narrative is, I presume, borrowed from Ephorus.

² Eurip. *Ion*, 1590.

³ Eurip. *Ion*, 64.

⁴ See the Fragments of these two plays in Matthiae's edition; compare Welcker, *Griechisch. Tragöd.* v. ii. p. 842. If we may judge from the Fragments of the Latin *Melanippē* of Ennius (see *Fragm. 2*, ed. Bothe), Hellēn was introduced as one of the characters of the piece.

CHAPTER VI

THE ÆOLIDS, OR SONS AND DAUGHTERS OF ÆOLUS

IF two of the sons of Hellēn, Dôrus and Xuthus, present to us families comparatively unnoticed in mythical narrative, the third son, Æolus, richly makes up for the deficiency. From him we pass to his seven sons and five daughters, amidst a great abundance of heroic and poetical incident.

In dealing however with these extensive mythical families, it is necessary to observe, that the legendary world of Greece, in the manner in which it is presented to us, appears invested with a degree of symmetry and coherence which did not originally belong to it. For the old ballads and stories which were sung or recounted at the multiplied festivals of Greece, each on its own special theme, have been lost: the religious narratives, which the *Exegêtēs* of every temple had present to his memory, explanatory of the peculiar religious ceremonies and local customs in his own town or *Dème*, had passed away. All these primitive elements, originally distinct and unconnected, are removed out of our sight, and we possess only an aggregate result, formed by many confluent streams of fable, and connected together by the agency of subsequent poets and logographers. Even the earliest agents in this work of connecting and systematising—the Hesiodic poets—have been hardly at all preserved. Our information respecting Grecian mythology is derived chiefly from the prose logographers who followed them, and in whose works, since a continuous narrative was above all things essential to them, the fabulous personages are woven into still more comprehensive pedigrees, and the original isolation of the legends still better disguised. Hekatæus, Pherekydēs, Hellanikus, and Akusilaus lived at a time when the idea of Hellas as one great whole, composed of fraternal sections, was deeply rooted in the mind of every Greek; and when the hypothesis of a few great families, branching out widely from one common stem, was more popular and acceptable than that of a distinct indigenous origin in each of the separate districts. These logographers, indeed, have themselves been lost; but Apollodôrus and the various scholiasts, our great immediate sources of information respecting Grecian mythology, chiefly borrowed from them: so that the legendary world of Greece is in fact known to us through them, combined with the dramatic and Alexandrine poets, their Latin imitators,

and the still later class of scholiasts — except indeed such occasional glimpses as we obtain from the Iliad and the Odyssey, and the remaining Hesiodic fragments which exhibit but too frequently a hopeless diversity when confronted with the narratives of the logographers.

Though Æolus (as has been already stated) is himself called the son of Hellén along with Dôrus and Xuthus, yet the legends concerning the Æolids, far from being dependent upon this genealogy, are not all even coherent with it: moreover the name of Æolus in the legend is older than that of Hellén, inasmuch as it occurs both in the Iliad and Odyssey.¹ Odysseus sees in the under-world the beautiful Tyrô, daughter of Salmôneus, and wife of Krêtheus, son of Æolus.

Æolus is represented as having reigned in Thessaly: his seven sons were Krêtheus, Sisyphus, Athamas, Salmôneus, Deiôn, Magnês, and Periérês: his five daughters, Canacê, Alcyonê, Peisidikê, Calycê and Perimêdê. The fables of this race seem to be distinguished by a constant introduction of the god Poseidôn, as well as by an unusual prevalence of haughty and presumptuous attributes among the Æolid heroes, leading them to affront the gods by pretences of equality, and sometimes even by defiance. The worship of Poseidôn must probably have been diffused and pre-eminent among a people with whom these legends originated.

SECTION I.—SONS OF ÆOLUS

Salmôneus is not described in the Odyssey as son of Æolus, but he is so denominated both in the Hesiodic Catalogue, and by the subsequent logographers. His daughter Tyrô became enamoured of the river Enipeus, the most beautiful of all streams that traverse the earth; she frequented the banks assiduously, and there the god Poseidôn found means to indulge his passion for her, assuming the character of the river-god himself. The fruit of this alliance were the twin brothers, Pelias and Nêleus: Tyrô afterwards was given in marriage to her uncle Krêtheus, another son of Æolus, by whom she had Æsôn, Pherês and Amythaôn—all names of celebrity in the heroic legends.² The adventures of Tyrô formed the subject

¹ Iliad, vi. 154. Σίσυφος Αἰολίδης, &c.

Again, Odyss. xi. 234—

Ἐνθ' ἦτοι πρώτην Τυρὼν ἴδον εὐπατέρειαν,
· Η φάτο Σαλμωνῆς ἀμύκονος ἔκγονος εἶναι,
· Φῆ δὲ Κρηθός γυνὴ ἐμμενεῖ Αἰολίδαο.

² Homer, Odyss. xi. 234-257; xv. 226.

of an affecting drama of Sophoklēs, now lost. Her father had married a second wife, named Sidérō, whose cruel counsels induced him to punish and torture his daughter on account of her intercourse with Poseidōn. She was shorn of her magnificent hair, beaten and ill-used in various ways, and confined in a loathsome dungeon. Unable to take care of her two children, she had been compelled to expose them immediately on their birth in a little boat on the river Enipeus; they were preserved by the kindness of a herdsman, and when grown up to manhood, rescued their mother, and revenged her wrongs by putting to death the iron-hearted Sidérō.¹ This pathetic tale respecting the long imprisonment of Tyrō is substituted by Sophoklēs in place of the Homeric legend, which represented her to have become the wife of Krétheus and mother of a numerous offspring.²

Her father, the unjust Salmôneus, exhibited in his conduct the most insolent impiety towards the gods. He assumed the name and title even of Zeus, and caused to be offered to himself the sacrifices destined for that god: he also imitated the thunder and lightning, by driving about with brazen caldrons attached to his chariot and casting lighted torches towards heaven. Such wickedness finally drew upon him the wrath of Zeus, who smote him with a thunderbolt, and effaced from the earth the city which he had founded, with all its inhabitants.³

¹ Diodôrus, iv. 68. Sophoklēs. Fragn. I. Τυρώ. Σαφῶς Σιδηρῶ καὶ φέρουσα τούνομα. The genius of Sophoklēs is occasionally seduced by this play upon the etymology of a name, even in the most impressive scenes of his tragedies. See Ajax, 425. Compare Hellanik. Fragn. p. 9, ed. Preller. There was a first and second edition of the Tyrō—τῆς δευτέρας Τυροῦ. Schol. ad Aristoph. Av. 276. See the few fragments of the lost drama in Dindorf's Collection, p. 53. The plot was in many respects analogous to the Antiopē of Euripidēs.

² A third story, different both from Homer and from Sophoklēs, respecting Tyrō, is found in Hyginus (Fab. Ix.): it is of a tragical cast, and borrowed, like so many other tales in that collection, from one of the lost Greek dramas.

³ Apollod. i 9, 7. Σαλμωνέις τ' ἄδικος καὶ ὑπέρθυμος Περιήρης. Hesiod, Fragn. Catal. 8. Marktscheffel.

Where the city of Salmôneus was situated, the ancient investigators were not agreed; whether in the Pisatid, or in Elis, or in Thessaly (see Strabo, viii. p. 356). Euripidēs in his *Æolus* placed him on the banks of the Alpheius (Eurip. Fragn. *Æol.* 1). A village and fountain in the Pisatid bore the name of Salmônē; but the mention of the river Enipeus seems to mark Thessaly as the original seat of the legend. But the *naïveté* of the tale preserved by Apollodorus (Virgil in the *Æneid*, vi. 586, has retouched it) marks its ancient date: the final circumstance of that tale was, that the city and its inhabitants were annihilated.

Pelias and Nēleus, "both stout vassals of the great Zeus," became engaged in dissension respecting the kingdom of Iōlkos in Thessaly. Pelias got possession of it, and dwelt there in plenty and prosperity; but he had offended the goddess Hērē by killing Sidērō upon her altar, and the effects of her wrath were manifested in his relations with his nephew Jasōn.¹

Nēleus quitted Thessaly, went into Peloponnēsus, and there founded the kingdom of Pylos. He purchased, by immense marriage presents, the privilege of wedding the beautiful Chlōris, daughter of Amphiōn, king of Orchomenos, by whom he had twelve sons and but one daughter²—the fair and captivating Pērō, whom suitors from all the neighbourhood courted in marriage. But Nēleus, "the haughtiest of living men,"³ refused to entertain the pretensions of any of them: he would grant his daughter only to that man who should bring to him the oxen of Iphiklos, from Phylakē in Thessaly. These precious animals were carefully guarded, as well by herdsmen as by a dog whom neither man nor animal could approach. Nevertheless, Bias, the son of Amythaōn, nephew of Nēleus, being desperately enamoured of Pērō, prevailed upon his brother Melampus to undertake for his sake the perilous adventure, in spite of the prophetic knowledge of the latter, which forewarned him that though he would ultimately succeed, the prize must be purchased by severe captivity and suffering. Melampus, in attempting to steal the oxen, was seized and put in prison; from whence nothing but his prophetic powers rescued him. Being acquainted with the language of worms, he heard these animals communicating to each other, in the roof over his head, that the beams were nearly eaten through and about to fall in. He communicated this intelligence to his guards, and demanded to be conveyed to another place of confinement, announcing that the roof would presently fall in and bury them. The prediction was fulfilled, and Phylakos, father of Iphiklos, full of wonder at this specimen of prophetic power, immediately caused him to be released. He further consulted him respecting the condition of his son Iphiklos, who was childless; and promised him the possession of the oxen on condition of his suggesting the means whereby offspring might

Ephorus makes Salmōneus king of the Epeians and of the Pisatæ (Fragm. 15, ed. Didot).

The lost drama of Sophoklēs, called Σαλμωνεὺς, was a δρᾶμα σατυρικόν. See Dindorf's Fragm. 483.

¹ Hom. Od. xi. 280. Apollod. i. 9, 9. κρατέρω θεράποντε Διὸς, &c.

² Diodōr. iv. 68.

³ Νηλέα τε μεγάθυμον, ἀγανάτατον ζωνταν (Hom. Odyss. xv. 228).

be ensured. A vulture having communicated to Melampus the requisite information, Podarkēs, the son of Iphiklos, was born shortly afterwards. In this manner Melampus obtained possession of the oxen, and conveyed them to Pylos, ensuring to his brother Bias the hand of Pérô.¹ How this great legendary character, by miraculously healing the deranged daughters of Proetos, procured both for himself and for Bias dominion in Argos, has been recounted in a preceding chapter.

Of the twelve sons of Nêleus, one at least, Periklymenos,—besides the ever-memorable Nestôr,—was distinguished for his exploits as well as for his miraculous gifts. Poseidôn, the divine father of the race, had bestowed upon him the privilege of changing his form at pleasure into that of any bird, beast, reptile, or insect.² He had occasion for all these resources, and he employed them for a time with success in defending his family against the terrible indignation of Héraklês, who, provoked by the refusal of Nêleus to perform for him the ceremony of purification after his murder of Iphitus, attacked the Nêleids at Pylos. Periklymenos by his extraordinary powers prolonged the resistance, but the hour of his fate was at length brought upon him by the intervention of Athênen, who pointed him out to Héraklês while he was perched as a bee upon the hero's chariot. He was killed, and Héraklês became completely victorious, overpowering Poseidôn, Hêrê, Arê, and Hadê, and even wounding the three latter, who assisted in the defence. Eleven of the sons of Nêleus perished by his hand, while Nestôr, then a youth, was preserved only by his accidental absence at Gerêna, away from his father's residence.³

¹ Hom. Od. xi. 278; xv. 234. Apollod. i. 9, 12. The basis of this curious romance is in the *Odyssey*, amplified by subsequent poets. There are points, however, in the old Homeric legend, as it is briefly sketched in the fifteenth book of the *Odyssey*, which seem to have been subsequently left out or varied. Nêleus seizes the property of Melampus during his absence; the latter, returning with the oxen from Phylakê, revenges himself upon Nêleus for the injury. *Odyss.* xv. 233.

² Hesiod, Catalog. ap. Schol. Apollôn. Rhod. i. 156; Ovid, Metam. xii. p. 556; Eustath. ad *Odyss.* xi. p. 284. Poseidôn carefully protects Antilochus, son of Nestôr, in the *Iliad*, xiii. 554-563.

³ Hesiod, Catalog. ap. Schol. Ven. ad *Iliad.* ii. 336: and Steph. Byz. v. *Γερῆνα*; Homer, Il. v. 392; xi. 693; Apollodôr. ii. 7, 3; Hesiod, *Scut. Herc.* 360; Pindar, Ol. ix. 32.

According to the Homeric legend, Nêleus himself was not killed by Héraklês: subsequent poets or logographers, whom Apollodôrûs follows, seem to have thought it an injustice, that the offence given by Nêleus himself should have been avenged upon his sons and not upon himself; they

The proud house of the Néleids was now reduced to Nestôr; but Nestôr singly sufficed to sustain its eminence. He appears not only as the defender and avenger of Pylos against the insolence and rapacity of his Epeian neighbours in Elis, but also as aiding the Lapithæ in their terrible combat against the Centaurs, and as companion of Thêseus, Peirithöus, and the other great legendary heroes who preceded the Trojan war. In extreme old age his once marvellous power of handling his weapons has indeed passed away, but his activity remains unimpaired, and his sagacity as well as his influence in counsel is greater than ever. He not only assembles the various Grecian chiefs for the armament against Troy, perambulating the districts of Hellas along with Odysseus, but takes a vigorous part in the siege itself, and is of pre-eminent service to Agamemnôn. And after the conclusion of the siege, he is one of the few Grecian princes who returns to his original dominions. He is found, in a strenuous and honoured old age, in the midst of his children and subjects,—sitting with the sceptre of authority on the stone bench before his house at Pylos,—offering sacrifice to Poseidôn, as his father Néleus had done before him,—and mourning only over the death of his favourite son Antilochus, who had fallen along with so many brave companions in arms, in the Trojan war.¹

After Nestôr the line of the Néleids numbers undistinguished names,—Bôrus, Pentilus, and Andropompus,—three successive generations down to Melanthus, who on the invasion of Peloponnêsus by the Hérakleids, quitted Pylos and retired to Athens, where he became king, in a manner which I shall hereafter recount. His son Kodrus was the last Athenian king; and Néleus, one of the sons of Kodrus, is mentioned as the principal conductor of what is called the Ionic emigration from Athens to Asia Minor.² It is certain that during the

therefore altered the legend upon this point, and rejected the passage in the Iliad as spurious (see Schol. Ven. ad Iliad. xi. 682).

The refusal of purification by Néleus to Héraklês is a genuine legendary cause: the commentators, who were disposed to spread a coating of history over these transactions, introduced another cause,—Néleus, as king of Pylos, had aided the Orchomenians in their war against Héraklês and the Thébans (see Sch. Ven. ad Iliad. xi. 689).

The neighbourhood of Pylos was distinguished for its ancient worship both of Poseidôn and of Hadês: there were abundant local legends respecting them (see Strabo, viii. pp. 344, 345).

¹ About Nestôr, Iliad, i. 260–275; ii. 370; xi. 670–770; Odyss. iii. 5, 110, 409.

² Hellanik. Frigm. 10, ed. Didot; Pausan. vii. 2, 3; Herodot. v. 65;

historical age, not merely the princely family of the Kodrids in Milétus, Ephesus, and other Ionic cities, but some of the greatest families even in Athens itself, traced their heroic lineage through the Néleids up to Poseidôn; and the legends respecting Nestôr and Periklymenos would find especial favour amidst Greeks with such feelings and belief. The Kodrids at Ephesus, and probably some other Ionic towns, long retained the title and honorary precedence of kings, even after they had lost the substantial power belonging to the office. They stood in the same relation, embodying both religious worship and supposed ancestry, to the Néleids and Poseidôn, as the chiefs of the Æolic colonies to Agamemnôn and Orestês. The Athenian despot Peisistratus was named after the son of Nestôr in the *Odyssey*; and we may safely presume that the heroic worship of the Néleids was as carefully cherished at the Ionic Milétus as at the Italian Metapontum.¹

Having pursued the line of Salmôneus and Néleus to the end of its legendary career, we may now turn back to that of another son of Æolus, Krêtheus,—a line hardly less celebrated in respect of the heroic names which it presents. Alkêstis, the most beautiful of the daughters of Pelias,² was promised by her father in marriage to the man who could bring him a lion and a boar tamed to the yoke and drawing together. Admêtus, son of Pherês, the eponymus of Pheræ in Thessaly, and thus grandson of Krêtheus, was enabled by the aid of Apollo to fulfil this condition, and to win her;³ for Apollo happened at that time to be in his service as a slave (condemned to this penalty by Zeus for having put to death the Cyclôpes), in which capacity he tended the herds and horses with such success, as to equip Eumêlus (the son of Admêtus) to the Trojan war with the finest horses in the Grecian army. Though menial duties were imposed upon him, even to the drudgery of grinding in the mill,⁴ he yet carried away with him

Strabo, xiv. p. 633. Hellanikus, in giving the genealogy from Néleus to Melanthus, traces it through Periklymenos and not through Nestôr: the words of Herodotus imply that *he* must have included Nestôr.

¹ Herodot. v. 67; Strabo, vi. p. 264; Mimnermus, Fragm. 9, Schneidewin.

² Iliad, ii. 715.

³ Apollodôr. i. 9, 15; Eustath. ad Iliad, ii. 711.

⁴ Euripid. Alkêst. init. Welcker; Griechisch. Tragöd. (p. 344) on the lost play of Sophoklês called Admêtus or Alkêstis; Hom. Iliad, ii. 766; Hygin. Fab. 50-51 (Sophoklês, Fr. Inc. 730; Dind. ap. Plutarch. Defect. Orac. p. 417). This tale of the temporary servitude of particular gods, by order of Zeus as a punishment for misbehaviour, recurs not unfrequently

a grateful and friendly sentiment towards his mortal master, whom he interfered to rescue from the wrath of the goddess Artemis, when she was indignant at the omission of her name in his wedding sacrifices. Admétus was about to perish by a premature death, when Apollo by earnest solicitation to the Fates, obtained for him the privilege that his life should be prolonged, if he could find any person to die a voluntary death in his place. His father and his mother both refused to make this sacrifice for him, but the devoted attachment of his wife Alkéstis disposed her to embrace with cheerfulness the condition of dying to preserve her husband. She had already perished, when Héraklés, the ancient guest and friend of Admétus, arrived during the first hour of lamentation; his strength and daring enabled him to rescue the deceased Alkéstis even from the grasp of Thanatos (Death), and to restore her alive to her disconsolate husband.¹

The son of Pelias, Akastus, had received and sheltered Pélus when obliged to fly his country in consequence of the involuntary murder of Eurytiōn. Kréthéis, the wife of Akastus, becoming enamoured of Pélus, made to him advances which he repudiated. Exasperated at his refusal, and determined to procure his destruction, she persuaded her husband that Pélus had attempted her chastity: upon which Akastus conducted Pélus out upon a hunting excursion among the woody regions of Mount Pélion, contrived to steal from him the sword fabricated and given by Héphæstos, and then left him, alone and unarmed, to perish by the hands of the Centaurs or by the wild beasts. By the friendly aid of the Centaur Cheirôn,

among the incidents of the mythical world. The poet Panyasis (ap. Clem. Alexand. Adm. ad Gent. p. 23)—

Τλῆ μὲν Δημήτρη, τλῆ δὲ κλυτὸς Ἀμφιγυνήει,
Τλῆ δὲ Ποσειδῶν, τλῆ δὲ ἀργυρόποδος Απόλλων
Ἄνδρι παρὰ θυητῷ θητεύμενος εἰς ἐναυτόν.
Τλῆ δὲ καὶ ὀβριμόθυμος Ἀρῆς ὑπὸ πατρὸς ἀνάγκης.

The old legend followed out the fundamental idea with remarkable consistency: Laômedôn, as the temporary master of Poseidôn and Apollo, threatens to bind them hand and foot, to sell them in the distant islands, and to cut off the ears of both when they come to ask for their stipulated wages (Iliad, xxi. 455). It was a new turn given to the story by the Alexandrine poets, when they introduced the motive of love, and made the servitude voluntary on the part of Apollo (Kallimachus, Hymn. Apoll. 49; Tibullus, Eleg. ii. 3, 11-30).

¹ Eurip. Alkéstis, Arg.; Apollod. i. 9, 15. To bring this beautiful legend more into the colour of history, a new version of it was subsequently framed: Héraklés was eminently skilled in medicine, and saved the life of Alkéstis when she was about to perish from a desperate malady (Plutarch, Amator. 17, vol. iv. p. 53, Wytt.).

however, Pélæus was preserved, and his sword restored to him: returning to the city, he avenged himself by putting to death both Akastus and his perfidious wife.¹

But amongst all the legends with which the name of Pelias is connected, by far the most memorable is that of Jasōn and the Argonautic expedition. Jasōn was son of Æsōn, grandson of Krétheus, and thus great-grandson of Æolus. Pelias, having consulted the oracle respecting the security of his dominion at Iôlkos, had received in answer a warning to beware of the man who should appear before him with only one sandal. He was celebrating a festival in honour of Poseidôn, when it so happened that Jasōn appeared before him with one of his feet unsandaled: he had lost one sandal in wading through the swollen current of the river Anauros. Pelias immediately understood that this was the enemy against whom the oracle had forewarned him. As a means of averting the danger, he imposed upon Jasōn the desperate task of bringing back to Iôlkos the Golden Fleece,—the fleece of that ram which had carried Phryxos from Achaia to Kolchis, and which Phryxos had dedicated in the latter country as an offering to the god Arès. The result of this injunction was the memorable expedition—of the ship Argô and her crew called the Argonauts, composed of the bravest and noblest youths of Greece—which cannot be conveniently included among the legends of the Æolids, and is reserved for a separate chapter.

The voyage of the Argô was long protracted, and Pelias, persuaded that neither the ship nor her crew would ever return, put to death both the father and mother of Jasōn, together with their infant son. Æsōn, the father, being permitted to choose the manner of his own death, drank bull's blood while performing a sacrifice to the gods. At length, however, Jasōn did return, bringing with him not only the golden fleece, but also Mêdea, daughter of Æêtês, king of Kolchis, as his wife,—a woman distinguished for magical skill and cunning, by whose assistance alone the Argonauts had succeeded in their project. Though determined to avenge himself upon Pelias, Jasōn knew that he could only succeed by stratagem. He remained with his companions at a short distance from Iôlkos, while Mêdea, feigning herself a fugitive from his ill-usage, entered the town alone, and procured access to the daughters of Pelias. By exhibitions of her magical

¹ The legend of Akastus and Pélæus was given in great detail in the Catalogue of Hesiod (Catalog. Fragm. 20-21, Marktscheft.); Schol. Pindar. Nem. iv. 95; Schol. Apoll. Rhod. i. 224; Apollod. iii. 13, 2.

powers she soon obtained unqualified ascendency over their minds. For example, she selected from the flocks of Pelias a ram in the extremity of old age, cut him up and boiled him in a caldron with herbs, and brought him out in the shape of a young and vigorous lamb:¹ the daughters of Pelias were made to believe that their old father could in like manner be restored to youth. In this persuasion they cut him up with their own hands and cast his limbs into the caldron, trusting that Mêdea would produce upon him the same magical effect. Mêdea pretended that an invocation to the moon was a necessary part of the ceremony: she went up to the top of the house as if to pronounce it, and there lighting the fire-signal concerted with the Argonauts, Jasôn and his companions burst in and possessed themselves of the town. Satisfied with having thus revenged himself, Jasôn yielded the principality of Iôlkos to Akastus, son of Pelias, and retired with Mêdea to Corinth. Thus did the goddess Hêrê gratify her ancient wrath against Pelias: she had constantly watched over Jasôn, and had carried the “all-notorious” Argô through its innumerable perils, in order that Jasôn might bring home Mêdea to accomplish the ruin of his uncle.² The misguided daughters of Pelias

¹ This incident was contained in one of the earliest dramas of Euripidês, the Πελιάδες, now lost. Moses of Chorénê (Progymnasm. ap. Maii ad Euseb. p. 43), who gives an extract from the argument, says that the poet “extremos mentiendi fines attingit.”

The Πιστόδομοι of Sophoklês seems also to have turned upon the same catastrophe (see Fragm. 479, Dindorf).

² The kindness of Hêrê towards Jasôn seems to be older in the legend than her displeasure against Pelias; at least it is specially noticed in the Odyssey, as the great cause of the escape of the ship Argô: ‘Αλλ’ Ἡρη παρέπεμψεν, ἐπει φίλος ἦν Ἰησων (xii. 70). In the Hesiodic Theogony Pelias stands to Jasôn in the same relation as Eurystheus to Hêraklês,—a severe taskmaster as well as a wicked and insolent man,—ὑβριστὴς Πελίης καὶ ἀτάσθαλος, δύστημος ἐργός (Theog. 995). Apollônias Rhodius keeps the wrath of Hêrê against Pelias in the foreground, i. 14; ii. 1134; iv. 242; see also Hygin. i. 13.

There is great diversity in the stories given of the proximate circumstances connected with the death of Pelias: Eurip. Mêd. 491; Apollodôr. i. 9, 27; Diodôr. iv. 50–52; Ovid, Metam. vii. 162, 203, 297, 347; Pausan. viii. 11, 2; Schol. ad Lycoph. 175.

In the legend of Akastus and Pêleus, as recounted above, Akastus was made to perish by the hand of Pêleus. I do not take upon me to reconcile these contradictions.

Pausanias mentions that he could not find in any of the poets, so far as he had read, the names of the daughters of Pelias, and that the painter Mikôn had given to them names (δύναματα δ' αὐταῖς ποιητὴς μὲν ἔθετο οὐδεὶς, θσα γ' ἐτελεξάμεθα ἡμεῖς, &c., Pausan. viii. 11, 1). Yet their names are given in the authors whom Diodôrus copied; and Alkêstis, at any rate, was most memorable. Mikôn gave the names Asteropeia and Antinoê,

departed as voluntary exiles to Arcadia : Akastus his son celebrated splendid funeral games in honour of his deceased father.¹

Jasón and Mèdea retired from Iôlkos to Corinth, where they resided ten years : their children were—Medeius, whom the Centaur Cheirôn educated in the regions of Mount Pélion,²—and Mermerus and Pherés, born at Corinth. After they had resided there ten years in prosperity, Jasón set his affections on Glaukê, daughter of Kreôn³ king of Corinth ; and as her father was willing to give her to him in marriage, he determined to repudiate Mèdea, who received orders forthwith to leave Corinth. Stung with this insult and bent upon revenge, Mèdea prepared a poisoned robe, and sent it as a marriage present to Glaukê : it was unthinkingly accepted and put on, and the body of the unfortunate bride was burnt up and consumed. Kreôn, her father, who tried to tear from her the burning garment, shared her fate and perished. The exulting Mèdea escaped by means of a chariot with winged serpents furnished to her by her grandfather Hélios : she placed herself under the protection of Ægêus at Athens, by whom she had a son named Médus. She left her young children in the sacred enclosure of the Akræan Hérê, relying on the protection of the altar to ensure their safety ; but the Corinthians were so exasperated

altogether different from those in Diodôrus. Both Diodôrus and Hyginus exonerate Alkéstis from all share in the death of her father (Hygin. f. 24).

The old poem called the *Nôστοι* (see Argum. ad Eurip. Mèd., and Schol. Aristophan. Equit. 1321) recounted, that Mèdea had boiled in a caldron the old Aësôn, father of Jasón, with herbs and incantations, and that she had brought him out young and strong. Ovid copies this (Metam. vii. 162–203). It is singular that Pherekydés and Simonidés said that she had performed this process upon Jasón himself (Schol. Aristoph. *I. c.*). Diogenes (ap. Stobæ. Florileg. t. xxix. 92) rationalises the story, and converts Mèdea from an enchantress into an improving and regenerating preceptress. The death of Aësôn, as described in the text, is given from Diodôrus and Apollodôrus. Mèdea seems to have been worshipped as a goddess in other places besides Corinth (see Athenagor. Legat. pro Christ. 12 ; Macrobius, i. 12, p. 247, Gronov.).

¹ These funeral games in honour of Pelias were among the most renowned of the mythical incidents : they were celebrated in a special poem by Stesichorus, and represented on the chest of Kypselus at Olympia. Kastôr, Meleager, Amphiaraos, Jasón, Pèleus, Mopsos, &c., contended in them (Pausan. v. 17, 4 ; Stesichori Fragm. 1, p. 54, ed. Klewe ; Athén. iv. 172). How familiar the details of them were to the mind of a literary Greek is indirectly attested by Plutarch, Sympos. v. 2, vol. iii. p. 762, Wytt.

² Hesiod, Theogon. 998.

³ According to the Schol. ad Eurip. Mèd. 20, Jasón marries the daughter of Hippotês the son of Kreôn, who is the son of Lykæthos. Lykæthos, after the departure of Bellerophôn from Corinth, reigned twenty-seven years ; then Kreôn reigned thirty-five years ; then came Hippotês.

against her for the murder of Kreōn and Glaukē, that they dragged the children away from the altar and put them to death. The miserable Jasōn perished by a fragment of his own ship Argō, which fell upon him while he was asleep under it,¹ being hauled on shore, according to the habitual practice of the ancients.

The first establishment at Ephyrē, or Corinth, had been founded by Sisyphus, another of the sons of Æolus, brother of Salmōneus and Krētheus.² The Æolid Sisyphus was distinguished as an unexampled master of cunning and deceit. He blocked up the road along the isthmus, and killed the strangers who came along it by rolling down upon them great stones from

¹ Apollodōr. i. 9, 27; Diodōr. iv. 54. The Mēdea of Euripidēs, which has fortunately been preserved to us, is too well known to need express reference. He makes Mēdea the destroyer of her own children, and borrows from this circumstance the most pathetic touches of his exquisite drama. Parmeniskos accused him of having been bribed by the Corinthians to give this turn to the legend; and we may regard the accusation as a proof that the older and more current tale imputed the murder of the children to the Corinthians (Schol. Eurip. Mēd. 275, where Didymos gives the story out of the old poem of Kreophylos). See also Ælian V. H. v. 21; Pausan. ii. 3, 6.

The most significant fact in respect to the fable is, that the Corinthians celebrated periodically a propitiatory sacrifice to Hērē Akrēa and to Mermerus and Phērēs, as an atonement for the sin of having violated the sanctuary of the altar. The legend grew out of this religious ceremony, and was so arranged as to explain and account for it (see Eurip. Mēd. 1376, with the Schol. Diodōr. iv. 55).

Mermerus and Phērēs were the names given to the children of Mēdea and Jasōn in the old Naupaktian Verses; in which, however, the legend must have been recounted quite differently, since they said that Jasōn and Mēdea had gone from Iōlkos, not to Corinth, but to Corcyra; and that Mermerus had perished in hunting on the opposite continent of Epirus. Kināethōn again, another ancient genealogical poet, called the children of Mēdea and Jasōn Eriōpis and Mēdos (Pausan. ii. 3, 7). Diodōrus gives them different names (iv. 34). Hesiod in the Theogony speaks only of Medeius as the son of Jasōn.

Mēdea does not appear either in the Iliad or Odyssey: in the former we find Agamēdē, daughter of Augeas, "who knows all the poisons (or medicines) which the earth nourishes" (Iliad, xi. 740); in the latter we have Circē, sister of Æêtēs father of Mēdea, and living in the Ææan island (Odyss. x. 70). Circē is daughter of the god Hēlios, as Mēdea is his granddaughter,—she is herself a goddess. She is in many points the parallel of Mēdea: she forewarns and preserves Odysseus throughout his dangers, as Mēdea aids Jasōn: according to the Hesiodic story she has two children by Odysseus, Agrius and Latinus (Theogon. 1001).

Odysseus goes to Ephyrē to Ilos the son of Mermerus, to procure poison for his arrows: Eustathius treats this Mermerus as the son of Mēdea (see Odyss. i. 270, and Eust.). As Ephyrē is the legendary name of Corinth, we may presume this to be a thread of the same mythical tissue.

² See Euripid. Æol.—Fragm. I, Dindorf; Dikæarch. Vit. Græc. p. 22.

the mountains above. He was more than a match even for the arch thief Autolykus, the son of Hermès, who derived from his father the gift of changing the colour and shape of stolen goods, so that they could no longer be recognised : Sisyphus, by marking his sheep under the foot, detected Autolykus when he stole them, and obliged him to restore the plunder. His penetration discovered the amour of Zeus with the nymph *Ægina*, daughter of the river-god Asôpus. Zeus had carried her off to the island of *Œnône* (which subsequently bore the name of *Ægina*) ; upon which Asôpus, eager to recover her, inquired of Sisyphus whither she was gone ; the latter told him what had happened, on condition that he should provide a spring of water on the summit of the *Acro-Corinthus*. Zeus, indignant with Sisyphus for this revelation, inflicted upon him in *Hadès* the punishment of perpetually heaving up a hill a great and heavy stone, which, so soon as it attained the summit, rolled back again in spite of all his efforts with irresistible force into the plain.¹

In the application of the *Æolid* genealogy to Corinth, Sisyphus, the son of *Æolus*, appears as the first name : but the old Corinthian poet *Eumélus* either found or framed an heroic genealogy for his native city independent both of *Æolus* and Sisyphus. According to this genealogy, *Ephyrê*, daughter of *Oceanus* and *Têthys*, was the primitive tenant of the Corinthian territory, *Asôpus* of the *Sikyônia* : both were assigned to the god *Hêlios*, in adjusting a dispute between him and *Poseidôn*, by *Briareus*. *Hêlios* divided the territory between his two sons *Æêtê*s and *Alôeus* : to the former he assigned Corinth, to the latter *Sikyônia*. *Æêtê*s, obeying the admonition of an oracle, emigrated to *Kolchis*, leaving his territory under the rule of *Bunos*, the son of *Hermès*, with the stipulation that it should

¹ Respecting Sisyphus, see *Apollodôr.* i. 9, 3 ; iii. 12, 6. *Pausan.* ii. 5, 1. *Schol. ad Iliad.* i. 180. Another legend about the amour of Sisyphus with *Tyrô*, is in *Hygin. fab.* 60, and about the manner in which he over-reached even *Hadès* (*Pherekydês ap. Schol. Iliad.* vi. 153). The stone rolled by Sisyphus in the under-world appears in *Odyss.* xi. 592. The name of Sisyphus was given during the historical age to men of craft and stratagem, such as *Derkylliôdês* (*Xenoph. Hellénic.* iii. 1, 8). He passed for the real father of *Odysseus*, though *Hyene* (*ad Apollodôr.* i. 9, 3) treats this as another Sisyphus, whereby he destroys the suitableness of the predicate as regards *Odysseus*. The duplication and triplication of synonymous personages is an ordinary resource for the purpose of reducing the legends into a seeming chronological sequence.

Even in the days of *Eumélus* a religious mystery was observed respecting the tombs of Sisyphus and *Nêleus*,—the latter had also died at Corinth,—no one could say where they were buried (*Pausan.* ii. 2, 2).

Sisyphus even overreached *Persephonê*, and made his escape from the under-world (*Theognis*, 702).

be restored whenever either he or any of his descendants returned. After the death of Bunos, both Corinth and Sikyōn were possessed by Epōpeus, son of Alōeus, a wicked man. His son Marathōn left him in disgust and retired into Attica, but returned after his death and succeeded to his territory, which he in turn divided between his two sons Corinthos and Sikyōn, from whom the names of the two districts were first derived. Corinthos died without issue, and the Corinthians then invited Mēdea from Iōlkos as the representative of Æêtēs : she with her husband Jasōn thus obtained the sovereignty of Corinth.¹ This legend of Eumēlus, one of the earliest of the genealogical poets, so different from the story adopted by Neophrōn or Euripidēs, was followed certainly by Simonidēs, and seemingly by Theopompus.² The incidents in it are imagined and arranged with a view to the supremacy of Mēdea ; the emigration of Æêtēs and the conditions under which he transferred his sceptre, being so laid out as to confer upon Mēdea an hereditary title to the throne. The Corinthians paid to Mēdea and to her children solemn worship, either divine or heroic, in conjunction with Hērē Akræa,³ and this was sufficient to give to Mēdea a prominent place in the genealogy composed by a Corinthian poet, accustomed to blend together gods, heroes, and men in the antiquities of his native city. According to the legend of Eumēlus, Jasōn became (through Mēdea) king of Corinth ; but she concealed the children of their marriage in the temple of Hērē, trusting that the goddess would render them immortal. Jasōn, discovering her proceedings, left her and retired in disgust to Iōlkos ; Mēdea also, being disappointed in her scheme, quitted the place, leaving the throne in the hands of Sisyphus, to whom, according to the story of Theopompus, she had become attached.⁴ Other legends recounted, that Zeus had contracted a passion for

¹ Pausan. ii. 1, 1 ; 3, 10. Schol. ad Pindar. Olymp. xiii. 74. Schol. Lycoph. 174-1024. Schol. Apoll. Rhod. iv. 1212.

² Simonid. ap. Schol. ad Eurip. Mēd. 10-20 ; Theopompus, Frigm. 340, Didot ; though Welcker (Der Episch. Cycl. p. 29) thinks that this does not belong to the historian Theopompus. Epimenidēs also followed the story of Eumēlus in making Æêtēs a Corinthian (Schol. ad Apoll. Rhod. iii. 242).

³ Περὶ δὲ τῆς εἰς Κόρινθον μετοικήσεως, Ἰππος ἐκτίθεται καὶ Ἐλλανικός· δτὶ δὲ βεβασίλευκε τῆς Κορίνθου ἡ Μῆδεια, Εὔμηλος ἴστορει καὶ Σιμωνίδης· δτὶ δὲ καὶ ἀθάνατος ἦν ἡ Μῆδεια, Μουσαῖος ἐν τῷ περὶ Ἰσθμίων ἴστορει, ὅμα καὶ περὶ τῶν τῆς Ἀκραίας Ἡρας ἑορτῶν ἐκτίθεται (Schol. Eurip. Mēd. 10). Compare also v. 1376, of the play itself, with the Scholia and Pausan. ii. 3, 6. Both Alkman and Hesiod represented Mēdea as a goddess (Athenagoras, Legatio pro Christianis, p. 54, ed. Oxon.).

⁴ Pausan. ii. 3, 10 ; Schol. Pindar. Olymp. xiii. 74.

Mêdea, but that she had rejected his suit from fear of the displeasure of Hêrê; who, as a recompense for such fidelity rendered her children immortal: ¹ moreover Mêdea had erected, by special command of Hêrê, the celebrated temple of Aphrodîte at Corinth. The tenor of these fables manifests their connexion with the temple of Hêrê: and we may consider the legend of Mêdea as having been originally quite independent of that of Sisyphus, but fitted on to it, in seeming chronological sequence, so as to satisfy the feelings of those Æolids of Corinth who passed for his descendants.

Sisyphus had for his sons Glaukôs and Ornytiôn. From Glaukôs sprang Bellerophôn, whose romantic adventures commence with the Iliad, and are further expanded by subsequent poets: according to some accounts he was really the son of Poseidôn, the prominent deity of the Æolid family.² The youth and beauty of Bellerophôn rendered him the object of a strong passion on the part of Anteia, wife of Proetos king of Argos. Finding her advances rejected, she contracted a violent hatred towards him, and endeavoured by false accusations to prevail upon her husband to kill him. Proetos refused to commit the deed under his own roof, but despatched him to his son-in-law the king of Lykia in Asia Minor, putting into his hands a folded tablet full of destructive symbols. Conformably to these suggestions, the most perilous undertakings were imposed upon Bellerophôn. He was directed to attack the monster Chimæra and to conquer the warlike Solymi as well as the Amazons: as he returned victorious from these enterprises, an ambuscade was laid for him by the bravest Lykian warriors, all of whom he slew. At length the Lykian king recognised him "as the genuine son of a god," and gave him his daughter in marriage together with half of his kingdom. The grandchildren of Bellerophôn, Glaukôs and Sarpedôn,—the latter a son of

¹ Schol. Pindar. Olymp. xiii. 32-74; Plutarch, De Herodot. Malign. p. 871.

² Pindar, Olymp. xiii. 98, and Schol. ad 1; Schol. ad Iliad. vi. 155; this seems to be the sense of Iliad, vi. 191.

The lost drama called *Jobatès* of Sophoklês, and the two by Euripidês called *Shenebæa* and *Bellerophôn*, handled the adventures of this hero. See the collection of the few fragments remaining in Dindorf, *Fragm. Sophok.* 280; *Fragm. Eurip.* p. 87-108; and *Hygin. fab.* 67.

Welcker (Griechische Tragöd. ii. p. 777-800) has ingeniously put together all that can be divined respecting the two plays of Euripidês.

Völcker seeks to make out that Bellerophôn is identical with Poseidôn Hippios,—a separate personification of one of the attributes of the god Poseidôn. For this conjecture he gives some plausible grounds (Mythologie des Japetisch. Geschlechts, p. 129 *seq.*).

his daughter Laodameia by Zeus,—combat as allies of Troy against the host of Agamemnôn.¹

We now pass from Sisyphus and the Corinthian fables to another son of Aeolus, Athamas, whose family history is not less replete with mournful and tragical incidents, abundantly diversified by the poets. Athamas, we are told, was king of Orchomenos; his wife Nephelê was a goddess, and he had by her two children, Phryxus and Hellê. After a certain time he neglected Nephelê, and took to himself as a new wife Inô, the daughter of Kadmus, by whom he had two sons, Learchus and Melikertês. Inô, looking upon Phryxus with the hatred of a stepmother, laid a snare for his life. She persuaded the women to roast the seed-wheat, which, when sown in this condition, yielded no crop, so that famine overspread the land. Athamas, sending to Delphi to implore counsel and a remedy, received for answer through the machinations of Inô with the oracle, that the barrenness of the fields could not be alleviated except by offering Phryxus as a sacrifice to Zeus. The distress of the people compelled him to execute this injunction, and Phryxus was led as a victim to the altar. But the power of his mother Nephelê snatched him from destruction, and procured for him from Hermès a ram with a fleece of gold, upon which he and his sister Hellê mounted and were carried across the sea. The ram took the direction of the Euxine sea and Kolchis: when they were crossing the Hellespont, Hellê fell off into the narrow strait, which took its name from that incident. Upon this, the ram, who was endued with speech, consoled the terrified Phryxus, and ultimately carried him safe to Kolchis: Aeêtês, king of Kolchis, son of the god Hêlios and brother of Circê, received Phryxus kindly, and gave him his daughter Chalkiopê in marriage. Phryxus sacrificed the ram to Zeus Phyxios, suspending the golden fleece in the sacred grove of Arês.

Athamas—according to some both Athamas and Inô—were afterwards driven mad by the anger of the goddess Hêrê; insomuch that the father shot his own son Learchus, and would also have put to death his other son Melikertês, if Inô had not snatched him away. She fled with the boy across the Megarian territory and Mount Geraneia, to the rock Moluris, overhanging the Sarônic Gulf: Athamas pursued her, and in order to escape him she leaped into the sea. She became a sea-goddess under the title of Leukothea; while the body of Melikertês was cast ashore on the neighbouring territory of Schoenus, and buried by his uncle Sisyphus, who was directed by the Nereids to pay to

¹ Iliad, vi. 155-210.

him heroic honours under the name of Palæmōn. The Isthmian games, one of the great periodical festivals of Greece, were celebrated in honour of the god Poseidōn, in conjunction with Palæmōn as a hero. Athamas abandoned his territory, and became the first settler of a neighbouring region called from him Athamantia, or the Athamantian plain.¹

The legend of Athamas connects itself with some sanguinary religious rites and very peculiar family customs, which prevailed at Alos, in Achaia Phthiōtis, down to a time² later than the historian Herodotus, and of which some remnant existed at Orchomenos even in the days of Plutarch. Athamas was worshipped at Alos as a hero, having both a chapel and a

¹ Eurip. Méd. 1250, with the Scholia, according to which story Ind killed both her children—

*'Ινω μανεῖσαν ἐκ θεῶν, ὅθ' ἡ Διὸς
Δάμαρ τιν ἐξπεμψε δωμάτων ἀλη.*

Compare Valckenaer, Diatribe in Eurip.; Apollodōr. i. 9, 1-2; Schol. ad Pindar. Argum. ad Isthm. p. 180. The many varieties of the fable of Athamas and his family may be seen in Hygin. fab. 1-5; Philostephanus ap. Schol. Iliad. vii. 86: it was a favourite subject with the tragedians, and was handled by Æschylus, Sophoklēs and Euripidēs in more than one drama (see Welcker, Griechische Tragöd. vol. i. p. 312-332; vol. ii. p. 612). Heyne says that the proper reading of the name is *Phrixus*, not *Phryxus*,—incorrectly, I think: *Φρύξος* connects the name both with the story of roasting the wheat (*φρύγειν*), and also with the country *Φρυγία*, of which it was pretended that Phryxus was the Eponymus. Ind, or Leukothea, was worshipped as a heroine at Megara as well as at Corinth (Pausan. i. 42, 3): the celebrity of the Isthmian games carried her worship, as well as that of Palæmōn, throughout most parts of Greece (Cicero, De Nat. Deor. iii. 16). She is the only personage of this family noticed either in the Iliad or *Odyssey*: in the latter poem she is a sea-goddess, who has once been a mortal, daughter of Kadmus; she saves Odysseus from imminent danger at sea by presenting to him her *κρήδεμανον* (*Odys. v. 433*; see the refinements of Aristidēs, *Orat. iii. p. 27*). The voyage of Phryxus and Hellē to Kolchis was related in the Hesiodic *Eoiai*: we find the names of the children of Phryxus by the daughter of Æêtēs quoted from that poem (Schol. ad Apollon. Rhod. ii. 1123): both Hesiod and Pherekydēs mentioned the golden fleece of the ram (Eratosthen. *Catasterism. 19*; Pherekyd. *Fragm. 53*, Didot).

Hekataeus preserved the romance of the speaking ram (Schol. Apoll. Rhod. i. 256); but Hellanikus dropped the story of Hellē having fallen into the sea: according to him she died at Paktyē in the Chersonesus (Schol. Apoll. Rhod. ii. 1144).

The poet Asius seems to have given the genealogy of Athamas by Themistō much in the same manner as we find it in Apollodōrus (Pausan. ix. 23, 3).

According to the ingenious refinements of Dionysius and Palæphatus, (Schol. ad Apoll. Rhod. ii. 1144; Palæphat. de Incred. c. 31) the ram of Phryxus was after all a man named Krios, a faithful attendant who aided in his escape; others imagined a ship with a ram's head at the bow.

² Plutarch, Quæst. Græc. c. 38, p. 299. Schol. Apoll. Rhod. ii. 655.

consecrated grove, attached to the temple of Zeus Laphystios. On the family of which he was the heroic progenitor, a special curse and disability stood affixed. The eldest of the race was forbidden to enter the prytaneion or government-house: if he was found within the doors of the building, the other citizens laid hold of him on his going out, surrounded him with garlands, and led him in solemn procession to be sacrificed as a victim at the altar of Zeus Laphystios. The prohibition carried with it an exclusion from all the public meetings and ceremonies, political as well as religious, and from the sacred fire of the state: many of the individuals marked out had therefore been bold enough to transgress it. Some had been seized on quitting the building and actually sacrificed; others had fled the country for a long time to avoid a similar fate.

The guides who conducted Xerxes and his army through southern Thessaly detailed to him this existing practice, coupled with the local legend, that Athamas, together with Inô, had sought to compass the death of Phryxus, who however had escaped to Kolchis; that the Achaeans had been enjoined by an oracle to offer up Athamas himself as an expiatory sacrifice to release the country from the anger of the gods; but that Kytissoros, son of Phryxus, coming back from Kolchis, had intercepted the sacrifice of Athamas,¹ whereby the anger of the gods remained still unappeased, and an undying curse rested upon the family.²

That such human sacrifices continued to a greater or less extent, even down to a period later than Herodotus, among the family who worshipped Athamas as their heroic ancestor, appears certain: mention is also made of similar customs in parts of Arcadia, and of Thessaly, in honour of Pêleus and Cheirôn.³

¹ Of the Athamas of Sophoklês, turning upon this intended but not consummated sacrifice, little is known, except from a passage of Aristophanê and the Scholia upon it (Nubes, 258)—

ἐπὶ τὶ στέφανον; οἵμοι, Σώκρατες,
ώστερ με τὸν Ἀθάμανθ' ὅπως μὴ θύσετε.

Athamas was introduced in this drama with a garland on his head, on the point of being sacrificed as an expiation for the death of his son Phryxus, when Hêraklês interposes and rescues him.

² Herodot. vii. 197. Plato, Minôs, p. 315.

³ Plato, Minôs, c. 5. *Kal oi τοῦ Ἀθάμαντος ἔκγονοι, οἵας θυσίας θύουσιν, Εὐλλῆνες δύτες.* As a testimony to the fact still existing or believed to exist, this dialogue is quite sufficient, though not the work of Plato.

Μόνιμος δ' ἱστορεῖ, ἐν τῇ τῶν θαυμασίων συναγωγῇ ἐν Πέλλῃ τῆς Θετταλίας Ἀχαιὸν ἀνθρωπὸν Πηλεῖ καὶ Χείρωνι καταθύεσθαι. (Clemens Alex. Admon. ad Gent. p. 27, Sylb.) Respecting the sacrifices at the temple of Zeus Lykæus in Arcadia, see Plato, Republ. viii. p. 565.

But we may reasonably presume, that in the period of greater humanity which Herodotus witnessed, actual sacrifice had become very rare. The curse and the legend still remained, but were not called into practical working, except during periods of intense national suffering or apprehension, during which the religious sensibilities were always greatly aggravated. We cannot at all doubt, that during the alarm created by the presence of the Persian king with his immense and ill-disciplined host, the minds of the Thessalians must have been keenly alive to all that was terrific in their national stories, and all that was expiatory in their religious solemnities. Moreover, the mind of Xerxes himself was so awe-struck by the tale, that he revered the dwelling-place consecrated to Athamas. The guides who recounted to him the romantic legend, gave it as the historical and generating cause of the existing rule and practice: a critical inquirer is forced (as has been remarked before) to reverse the order of precedence, and to treat the practice as having been the suggesting cause of its own explanatory legend.

The family history of Athamas, and the worship of Zeus Laphystios, are expressly connected by Herodotus with Alos in Achaea Phthiotis—one of the towns enumerated in the Iliad as under the command of Achilles. But there was also a mountain called Laphystion, and a temple and worship of Zeus Laphystios between Orchomenos and Koroneia, in the northern portion of the territory known in the historical ages as Boeotia. Here too the family story of Athamas is localised, and Athamas is presented to us as king of the districts of Koroneia, Haliartus and Mount Laphystion: he is thus interwoven with the Orchomenian genealogy.¹ Andreus (we are

Pausanias (viii. 38, 5) seems to have shrunk, when he was upon the spot, even from inquiring what they were—a striking proof of the fearful idea which he had conceived of them. Plutarch (De Defectu Oracul. c. 14) speaks of *τὰς πάλαι ποιουμένας ἀνθρωποθυσίας*. The Schol. ad Lycophron. 229, gives a story of children being sacrificed to Melikertes at Tenedos; and Apollodorus (ad Porphy. de Abstinentiâ, ii. 55, see Apollod. Fragm. 20, ed. Didot) said that the Lacedaemonians had sacrificed a man to Arès—*καλλακεδαιμονίους φησίν δὲ Ἀπολλάδωρος τῷ Ἀρεὶ θύειν ξυθρωπόν*. About Salamis in Cyprus, see Lactantius, De Falsâ Religione, i. c. 21. “Apud Cypri Salaminem, humanam hostiam Jovi Teucrus immolavit, idque sacrificium posteris tradidit: quod est nuper Hadriano imperante sublatum.”

Respecting human sacrifices in historical Greece, consult a good section in K. F. Hermann’s *Gottesdienstliche Alterthümer der Griechen* (sect. 27). Such sacrifices had been a portion of primitive Grecian religion, but had gradually become obsolete everywhere—except in one or two solitary cases, which were spoken of with horror. Even in these cases, too, the reality of the fact, in later times, is not beyond suspicion.

¹ Pausan. ix. 34, 4.

told), son of the river Pêneios, was the first person who settled in the region: from him it received the name Andréis. Athamas, coming subsequently to Andreus, received from him the territory of Korôneia and Haliartus with Mount Laphystion: he gave in marriage to Andreus Euippê, daughter of his son Leucôn, and the issue of this marriage was Eteoklês, said to be the son of the river Kêphisos. Korônos and Haliartus, grandsons of the Corinthian Sisyphus, were adopted by Athamas, as he had lost all his children. But when his grandson Presbôn, son of Phryxus, returned to him from Kolchis, he divided his territory in such manner that Korônos and Haliartus became the founders of the towns which bore their names. Almôn, the son of Sisyphus, also received from Eteoklês a portion of territory, where he established the village Almônes.¹

With Eteoklês began, according to a statement in one of the Hesiodic poems, the worship of the Charites or Graces, so long and so solemnly continued at Orchomenos in the periodical festival of the Charitêsia, to which many neighbouring towns and districts seem to have contributed.² He also distributed the inhabitants into two tribes—Eteokleia and Kêphisia. He died childless, and was succeeded by Almos, who had only two daughters, Chrysê and Chrysogeneia. The son of Chrysê by the god Arês was Phlegyas, the father and founder of the warlike and predatory Phlegyæ, who despoiled every one within their reach, and assaulted not only the pilgrims on their road to Delphi, but even the treasures of the temple itself. The offended god punished them by continued thunder, by earthquakes, and by pestilence, which extinguished all this impious race, except a scanty remnant who fled into Phokis.

Chrysogeneia, the other daughter of Almos, had for issue, by the god Poseidôn, Minyas: the son of Minyas was Orchomenos. From these two was derived the name both of Minyæ for the people, and of Orchomenos for the town.³ During the reign of Orchomenos, Hyéttus came to him from Argos, having become an exile in consequence of the death of Molyros: Orchomenos assigned to him a portion of land, where he founded the village called Hyéttus.⁴ Orchomenos, having no

¹ Pausan. ix. 34, 5.

² Ephorus, Frigm. 68, Marx.

³ Pausan. ix. 36, 1-3. See also a legend, about the three daughters of Minyas, which was treated by the Tanagraean poetess Korinna, the contemporary of Pindar (Antonin. Liberalis. Narr. x.).

⁴ This exile of Hyéttus was recounted in the Eoiai. Hesiod. Frigm. 148, Markt.

issue, was succeeded by Klymenos, son of Presbōn, of the house of Athamas: Klymenos was slain by some Thēbans during the festival of Poseidōn at Onchēstos; and his eldest son, Erginus, to avenge his death, attacked the Thēbans with his utmost force;—an attack, in which he was so successful, that the latter were forced to submit, and to pay him an annual tribute.

The Orchomenian power was now at its height: both Minyas and Orchomenos had been princes of surpassing wealth, and the former had built a spacious and durable edifice which he had filled with gold and silver. But the success of Erginus against Thēbes was soon terminated and reversed by the hand of the irresistible Hēraklēs, who rejected with disdain the claim of tribute, and even mutilated the envoys sent to demand it: he not only emancipated Thēbes, but broke down and impoverished Orchomenos.¹ Erginus in his old age married a young wife, from which match sprang the illustrious heroes, or gods, Trophōnīus and Agamēdēs; though many (amongst whom is Pausanias himself) believed Trophōnīus to be the son of Apollo.² Trophōnīus, one of the most memorable persons in Grecian mythology, was worshipped as a god in various places, but with especial sanctity as Zeus Trophōnīus at Lebadeia: in his temple at this town, the prophetic manifestations outlasted those of Delphi itself.³ Trophōnīus and Agamēdēs, enjoying matchless renown as architects, built⁴ the temple of Delphi, the thalamus of Amphitryōn at Thēbes, and also the inaccessible vault of Hyrieus at Hyria, in which they are said to have left one stone removeable at pleasure so as to reserve for themselves a secret entrance. They entered so frequently, and stole so much gold and silver, that Hyrieus, astonished at his losses, at length spread a fine net, in which

¹ Pausan. ix. 37, 2. Apollod. ii. 4, 11. Diodōr. iv. 10. The two latter tell us that Erginus was slain. Klymenē is among the wives and daughters of the heroes seen by Odysseus in Hadēs: she is termed by the Schol. daughter of Minyas (Odyss. xi. 325).

² Pausan. ix. 37, 1-3. Δέγεται δὲ δὲ Τροφώνιος Ἀπόλλωνος εἶναι, καὶ οὐκ Ἐργίνου· καὶ ἔγώ τε πείθομαι, καὶ δύστις παρὰ Τροφώνιον ἥλθε δὴ μαντευσθμένος.

³ Plutarch, De Defectu Oracul. c. 5, p. 411. Strabo, ix. p. 414. The mention of the honeyed cakes, both in Aristophanes (Nub. 508) and Pausanias (ix. 39, 5), indicates that the curious preliminary ceremonies, for those who consulted the oracle of Trophōnīus, remained the same after a lapse of 550 years. Pausanias consulted it himself. There had been at one time an oracle of Teiresias at Orchomenos: but it had become silent at an early period (Plutarch, Defect. Oracul. c. 44, p. 434).

⁴ Homer, Hymn. Apoll. 296. Pausan. ix. 11, 1.

Agamêdês was inextricably caught: Trophônias cut off his brother's head and carried it away, so that the body, which alone remained, was insufficient to identify the thief. Like Amphiaraos, whom he resembles in more than one respect, Trophônias was swallowed up by the earth near Lebadeia.¹

From Trophônias and Agamêdês the Orchomenian genealogy passes to Askalaphos and Ialmenos, the sons of Arês by Astyochê, who are named in the Catalogue of the Iliad as leaders of the thirty ships from Orchomenos against Troy. Azeus, the grandfather of Astyochê in the Iliad, is introduced as the brother of Erginus² by Pausanias, who does not carry the pedigree lower.

The genealogy here given out of Pausanias is deserving of the more attention, because it seems to have been copied from the special history of Orchomenos by the Corinthian Kallippus, who again borrowed from the native Orchomenian poet, Chersias: the works of the latter had never come into the hands of Pausanias. It illustrates forcibly the principle upon which these mythical genealogies were framed, for almost every personage in the series is an Eponymus. Andreus gave his name to the country, Athamas to the Athamantian plain; Minyas, Orchomenos, Korônus, Haliartus, Almos, and Hyêttos, are each in like manner connected with some name of people, tribe, town, or village; while Chrysê and Chrysogeneia have their origin in the reputed ancient wealth of Orchomenos. Abundant discrepancies are found, however, in respect to this old genealogy, if we look to other accounts. According to one statement, Orchomenos was the son of Zeus, by Isionê, daughter of Danaus; Minyas was the son of Orchomenos (or rather Poseidôn) by Hermippê, daughter of Bœôtos; the sons of Minyas were Presbôn, Orchomenos, Athamas, and Dioc-thôndas.³ Others represented Minyas as son of Poseidôn by Kallirrhoê, an Oceanic nymph,⁴ while Dionysius called him son of Arês, and Aristodêmus, son of Aleas: lastly, there were

¹ Pausan. ix. 37, 3. A similar story, but far more romantic and amplified, is told by Herodotus (ii. 121), respecting the treasury-vault of Rhampsinitus, king of Egypt. Charax (ap. Schol. Aristoph. Nub. 508) gives the same tale, but places the scene in the treasury-vault of Augeas, king of Elis, which he says was built by Trophônias, to whom he assigns a totally different genealogy. The romantic adventures of the tale rendered it eminently fit to be interwoven at some point or another of legendary history, in any country.

² Pausan. ix. 38, 6; 29, 1.

³ Schol. Apollôn. Rhod. i. 230. Compare Schol. ad Lycophron. 873.

⁴ Schol. Pindar, Olymp. xiv. 5.

not wanting authors who termed both Minyas and Orchomenos sons of Eteoklēs.¹ Nor do we find in any one of these genealogies the name of Amphiōn the son of Iasus, who figures so prominently in the Odyssey as king of Orchomenos, and whose beautiful daughter Chlōris is married to Nêleus. Pausanias mentions him, but not as king, which is the denomination given to him in Homer.²

The discrepancies here cited are hardly necessary in order to prove that these Orchomenian genealogies possess no historical value. Yet some probable inferences appear deducible from the general tenor of the legends, whether the facts and persons of which they are composed be real or fictitious.

Throughout all the historical age, Orchomenos is a member of the Boeōtian confederation. But the Boeōtians are said to have been immigrants into the territory which bore their name from Thessaly; and prior to the time of their immigration, Orchomenos and the surrounding territory appear as possessed by the Minyæ, who are recognised in that locality both in the Iliad and in the Odyssey,³ and from whom the constantly recurring Eponymus, king Minyas, is borrowed by the genealogists. Poetical legend connects the Orchomenian Minyæ on the one side, with Pylos and Triphylia in Peloponnēsus; on the other side, with Phthiōtis and the town of Iōlkos in Thessaly; also with Corinth,⁴ through Sisyphus and his sons. Pherekydēs represented Nêleus, king of Pylos, as having also been king of Orchomenos.⁵ In the region of Triphylia, near to or coincident with Pylos, a Minyeian river is mentioned by Homer; and we find traces of residents called Minyæ even in the historical times, though the account given by Herodotus

¹ Schol. Pindar. Isthm. i. 79. Other discrepancies in Schol. Vett. ad Iliad. ii. Catalog. 18.

² Odyss. xi. 283. Pausan. ix. 36, 3.

³ Iliad, ii. 5, 11. Odyss. xi. 283. Hesiod, Frigm. Eoiai, 27, Dūntz. Τίκεν δ' Ὀρχομενὸν Μινυῆιόν. Pindar, Olymp. xiv. 4. Παλαιγύνων Μινυῶν ἐπίσκοποι. Herodot. i. 146. Pausanias calls them Minyæ even in their dealings with Sylla (ix. 30, 1). Buttmann, in his Dissertation (über die Minyæ der Altesten Zeit, in the Mythologus, Diss. xxi. p. 218), doubts whether the name Minyæ was ever a real name; but all the passages make against his opinion.

⁴ Schol. Apoll. Rhod. ii. 1186. i. 230. Σκῆψιος δὲ Δημήτριος φησι τοὺς περὶ τὴν Ιωλκὸν οἰκοῦντας Μινύας καλεῖσθαι; and i. 763. Τὴν γὰρ Ιωλκὸν οἱ Μινύαι ὄκουν, ὡς φησι Σιμωνίδης ἐν Συμμίκτοις: also Eustath. ad Iliad. ii. 512. Steph. Byz. v. Μινύα. Orchomenos and Pylos run together in the mind of the poet of the Odyssey, xi. 458.

⁵ Pherekyd. Frigm. 56, Didot. We see by the 55th Fragment of the same author, that he extended the genealogy of Phryxos to Pheræ in Thessaly.

of the way in which they came thither is strange and unsatisfactory.¹

Before the great changes which took place in the inhabitants of Greece from the immigration of the Thesprôtians into Thessaly, of the Bœôtians into Bœôtia, and of the Dôrians and Ætôlians into Peloponnêsus, at a date which we have no means of determining, the Minyæ and tribes fraternally connected with them seem to have occupied a large portion of the surface of Greece, from Iôlkos in Thessaly to Pylos in the Peloponnêsus. The wealth of Orchomenos is renowned even in the Iliad;² and when we study its topography in detail, we are furnished with a probable explanation both of its prosperity and its decay. Orchomenos was situated on the northern bank of the lake Kôpais, which receives not only the river Kêphisos from the valleys of Phôkis, but also other rivers from Parnassus and Helicôn. The waters of the lake find more than one subterranean egress—partly through natural rifts and cavities in the limestone mountains, partly through a tunnel pierced artificially more than a mile in length—into the plain on the north-eastern side, from whence they flow into the Eubœan sea near Larymna.³ And it appears that, so long as these channels were diligently watched and kept clear, a large portion of the lake was in the condition of alluvial land, pre-eminently rich and fertile. But when the channels came to be either neglected, or designedly choked up by an enemy, the water accumulated to such a degree, as to occupy the soil of more than one ancient town, to endanger the position of Kôpæ, and to occasion the change of the site of Orchomenos itself from the plain to the declivity of Mount Hyphanteion. An engineer, Kratës, began the clearance of the obstructed water-courses in the reign of Alexander the Great, and by his commission—the destroyer of Thêbes being anxious to re-establish the extinct prosperity of Orchomenos. He succeeded so far as partially to drain and

¹ Herodot. iv. 145. Strabo, viii. 337–347. Hom. Iliad, xi. 721. Pausan. v. 1, 7, ποταμὸν Μινυῆτον, near Elis.

² Iliad, ix. 381.

³ See the description of these channels or Katabothra in Colonel Leake's Travels in Northern Greece, vol. ii. c. 15, p. 281–293, and still more elaborately in Fiedler, Reise durch alle Theile des Königreichs Griechenlands, Leipzig, 1840. He traced fifteen perpendicular shafts sunk for the purpose of admitting air into the tunnel, the first separated from the last by about 5900 feet: they are now of course overgrown and stopped up (vol. i. p. 115).

Forchhammer states the length of this tunnel as considerably greater than what is here mentioned. He also gives a plan of the Lake Kôpais with the surrounding region, which I have inserted in this History.

diminish the lake, whereby the site of more than one ancient city was rendered visible: but the revival of Thêbes by Kassander, after the decease of Alexander, arrested the progress of the undertaking, and the lake soon regained its former dimensions, to contract which no farther attempt was made.¹

According to the Thêban legend,² Hêraklês, after his defeat of Erginus, had blocked up the exit of the waters, and converted the Orchomenian plain into a lake. The spreading of these waters is thus connected with the humiliation of the Minyæ; and there can be little hesitation in ascribing to these ancient tenants of Orchomenos, before it became bœotised, the enlargement and preservation of the protective channels. Nor could such an object have been accomplished, without combined action and acknowledged ascendancy on the part of that city over its neighbours, extending even to the sea at Larymna, where the river Kêphisos discharges itself. Of its extended influence, as well as of its maritime activity, we find a remarkable evidence in the ancient and venerated Amphiktyony at Kalauria. The little island so named, near the harbour of Trœzên, in Peloponnêsus, was sacred to Poseidôn, and an asylum of inviolable sanctity. At the temple of Poseidôn, in Kalauria, there had existed, from unknown date, a periodical sacrifice, celebrated by seven cities in common—Hermionê, Epidaurus, Ægina, Athens, Prasiæ, Nauplia, and the Minyeian Orchomenos. This ancient religious combination dates from the time when Nauplia was independent of Argos, and Prasiæ of Sparta: Argos and Sparta, according to the usual practice in Greece, continued to fulfil the obligation each on the part of its respective dependent.³ Six out of the seven states are at once sea-towns, and near enough to Kalauria to account for their participation in this Amphiktyony. But the junction of Orchomenos, from its comparative remoteness, becomes inexplicable, except on the

¹ We owe this interesting fact to Strabo, who is however both concise and unsatisfactory, viii. p. 406-407. It was affirmed that there had been two ancient towns, named Eleusis and Athénæ, originally founded by Cecrôps, situated on the lake, and thus overflowed (Steph. Byz. v. Ἀθῆναι. Diogen. Laërt. iv. 23. Pausan. ix. 24, 2). For the plain or marsh near Orchomenos, see Plutarch, Sylla, c. 20-22.

² Diodôr. iv. 18. Pausan. ix. 38, 5.

³ Strabo, viii. p. 374. Ἡν δὲ καὶ Ἀμφικτυονία τις περὶ τὸ ιερὸν τοῦτο, ἐπτὰ πόλεων αἱ μετεῖχον τῆς θυσίας. Ἰσαν δὲ Ἐρμιών, Ἐπίδαυρος, Αἴγινα, Ἀθῆναι, Πρασιέis, Ναυπλιέis, Ὁρχομενὸς δὲ Μινύειος. Τπέρ μὲν οὖν τῶν Ναυπλιέων Ἀργεῖοι, ὑπὲρ Πρασιέων δὲ Λακεδαιμόνιοι, ξυνετέλουν.

supposition that its territory reached the sea, and that it enjoyed a considerable maritime traffic—a fact which helps to elucidate both its legendary connexion with Iôlkos, and its partnership in what is called the Iônic emigration.¹

The great power of Orchomenos was broken down and the city reduced to a secondary and half-dependent position by the Bœôtians of Thêbes; at what time and under what circumstances, history has not preserved. The story that the Thêban hero, Hêraklês, rescued his native city from servitude and tribute to Orchomenos, since it comes from a Kadmeian and not from an Orchomenian legend, and since the details of it were favourite subjects of commemoration in the Thêban temples,² affords a presumption that Thêbes was really once dependent on Orchomenos. Moreover the savage mutilations inflicted by the hero on the tribute-seeking envoys, so faithfully portrayed in his surname Rhinokoloustês, infuse into the mythe a portion of that bitter feeling which so long prevailed between Thêbes and Orchomenos, and which led the Thêbans, as soon as the battle of Leuktra had placed supremacy in their hands, to destroy and depopulate their rival.³ The ensuing generation saw the same fate retorted upon Thêbes, combined with the restoration of Orchomenos. The legendary grandeur of this city continued, long after it had ceased to be distinguished for wealth and power, imperishably recorded both in the minds of the nobler citizens and in the compositions of the poets: the emphatic language of Pausanias shows how much he found concerning it in the old epic.⁴

SECTION II.—DAUGHTERS OF ÆOLUS

With several of the daughters of Æolus memorable mythical pedigrees and narratives are connected. Alkyone

¹ Pausan. ix. 17, 1; 26, 1. ² Herod. i. 146. Pausan. vii. 2, 2.

³ Theocrit. xvi. 104—

‘Ω Ἐτεόκλειοι θύγατρες θεαί, αἱ Μινύειον
Ορχομενὸν φιλέοισατ, ἀπεχθόμενὸν ποκα Θήβαις.

The Scholiast gives a sense to these words much narrower than they really bear. See Diodôr. xv. 79; Pausan. ix. 15. In the oration which Isokratês places in the mouth of a Platæan, complaining of the oppressions of Thêbes, the ancient servitude and tribute to Orchomenos are cast in the teeth of the Thêbans (Isokrat. Orat. Platæic. vol. iii. p. 32, Auger).

⁴ Pausan. ix. 34, 5. See also the fourteenth Olympic Ode of Pindar, addressed to the Orchomenian Asopikus. The learned and instructive work of K. O. Müller, *Orchomenos und die Minyer*, embodies everything which can be known respecting this once-memorable city; indeed the contents of the work extend much further than its title promises.

married Kêyx, the son of Eôsphoros, but both she and her husband displayed in a high degree the overweening insolence common in the Æolic race. The wife called her husband Zeus, while he addressed her as Hêrê, for which presumptuous act Zeus punished them by changing both into birds.¹

Canacê had by the god Poseidôn several children, amongst whom were Epôpeus and Alôeus.² Alôeus married Iphimêdea; who became enamoured of the god Poseidôn, and boasted of her intimacy with him. She had by him two sons, Otos and Ephialtê, the huge and formidable Alôids,—Titanic beings, nine fathoms in height and nine cubits in breadth, even in their boyhood, before they had attained their full strength. These Alôids defied and insulted the gods in Olympus. They paid their court to Hêrê and Artemis; moreover they even seized and bound Arê, confining him in a brazen chamber for thirteen months. No one knew where he was, and the intolerable chain would have worn him to death, had not Eribœa, the jealous stepmother of the Alôids, revealed the place of his detention to Hermê, who carried him surreptitiously away when at the last extremity. Arê could obtain no atonement for such an indignity. Otos and Ephialtê even prepared to assault the gods in heaven, piling up Ossa on Olympus and Pelion on Ossa, in order to reach them. And this they would have accomplished had they been allowed to

¹ Apollodôr. i. 7, 4. Kêyx,—king of Trachin,—the friend of Hêraklês and protector of the Hêrakleids to the extent of his power (Hesiod. Scut. Hercul. 355-473; Apollodôr. ii. 7, 5; Hekatae. Fragm. 353, Didot).

² Canacê, daughter of Æolus, is a subject of deep tragical interest both in Euripidês and Ovid. The eleventh Heroic Epistle of the latter, founded mainly on the lost tragedy of the former called Æolus, purports to be from Canacê to Macareus, and contains a pathetic description of the ill-fated passion between a brother and sister: see the Fragments of the Æolus in Dindorf's collection. In the tale of Kaunos and Byblis, both children of Milêtos, the results of an incestuous passion are different, but hardly less melancholy (Parthenios, Narr. xi.).

Makar, the son of Æolus, is the primitive settler of the island of Lesbos (Hom. Hymn. Apoll. 37): moreover, in the Odyssey, Æolus, son of Hippotê, the dispenser of the winds, has six sons and six daughters, and marries the former to the latter (Odyss. x. 7). The two persons called Æolus are brought into connexion genealogically (see Schol. ad Odyss. l. c., and Diodôr. iv. 67), but it seems probable that Euripidês was the first to place the names of Macareus and Canacê in that relation which confers upon them their poetical celebrity. Sostratus (ap. Stobæum, t. 614, p. 404) can hardly be considered to have borrowed from any older source than Euripidês. Welcker (Griech. Tragöd. vol. ii. p. 860) puts together all that can be known respecting the structure of the lost drama of Euripidês.

grow to their full maturity ; but the arrows of Apollo put a timely end to their short-lived career.¹

The genealogy assigned to Kalykê, another daughter of Æolus, conducts us from Thessaly to Elis and Ætolia. She married Aëthlius (the son of Zeus by Prôtogeneia, daughter of Deukaliôn and sister of Hellén), who conducted a colony out of Thessaly, and settled in the territory of Elis. He had for his son Endymiôn, respecting whom the Hesiodic Catalogue and the Eoiai related several wonderful things. Zeus granted him the privilege of determining the hour of his own death, and even translated him into heaven, which he forfeited by daring to pay court to Hêrê: his vision in this criminal attempt was cheated by a cloud, and he was cast out into the under-world.² According to other stories, his great beauty caused the goddess Sélène to become enamoured of him, and to visit him by night during his sleep :—the sleep of Endymiôn became a proverbial expression

¹ Iliad, v. 386 ; Odyss. xi. 306 ; Apollodôr. i. 7, 4. So Typhêus in the Hesiodic Theogony, the last enemy of the gods, is killed before he comes to maturity (Theog. 837). For the different turns given to this ancient Homeric legend, see Heyne, ad Apollodôr. l. c., and Hyginus, f. 28. The Alôids were noticed in the Hesiodic poems (ap. Schol. Apoll. Rhod. i. 482). Odysseus does not see *them* in Hadês, as Heyne by mistake says ; he sees their mother Iphimédea. Virgil (Æn. vi. 582) assigns to them a place among the sufferers of punishment in Tartarus.

Eumêlus, the Corinthian poet, designated Alôeus as son of the god Hêlios and brother of Æêtês, the father of Médea (Eumêl. Fragn. 2, Markscheffel). The scene of their death was subsequently laid in Naxos (Pindar, Pyth. iv. 88) : their tombs were seen at Anthêdôn in Bœôtia (Pausan. ix. 22, 4). The very curious legend alluded to by Pausanias from Hegisinoos, the author of an *Atthis*,—to the effect that Otos and Ephialtês were the first to establish the worship of the Muses in Helikôn, and that they founded Askra along with Æôklos, the son of Poseidôn,—is one which we have no means of tracing farther (Pausan. ix. 29, 1).

The story of the Alôids, as Diodôrus gives it (v. 51, 52), diverges on almost every point : it is evidently borrowed from some Naxian archæologist, and the only information which we collect from it is, that Otos and Ephialtês received heroic honours at Naxos. The views of O. Müller (Orchomenos, p. 387) appear to me unusually vague and fanciful.

Ephialtês takes part in the combat of the giants against the gods (Apollodôr. t. 6, 2), where Heyne remarks, as in so many other cases, “ Ephialtês hic non confundendus cum altero Alôei filio.” An observation just indeed, if we are supposed to be dealing with personages and adventures historically real—but altogether misleading in regard to these legendary characters. For here the general conception of Ephialtês and his attributes is in both cases the same ; but the particular adventures ascribed to him cannot be made to consist, as facts, one with the other.

² Hesiod, Akusilaus and Pherekydês, ap. Schol. Apollôn. Rhod. iv. 57. “*Ιν δ' αὐτῷ θαύματον ταύτης.*” The Scholium is very full of matter, and exhibits many of the diversities in the tale of Endymiôn : see also Apollodôr. i. 7, 5 ; Pausan. v. 1, 2 ; Conôn, Narr. 14.

for enviable, undisturbed, and deathless repose.¹ Endymiōn had for issue (Pausanias gives us three different accounts, and Apollodōrus a fourth, of the name of his wife), Epeios, Ætōlus, Pæōn, and a daughter Eurykydē. He caused his three sons to run a race on the stadium at Olympia, and Epeios, being victorious, was rewarded by becoming his successor in the kingdom: it was after him that the people were denominated Epeians.

Epeios had no male issue, and was succeeded by his nephew Eleios, son of Eurykydē by the god Poseidōn: the name of the people was then changed from Epeians to Eleians. Ætōlus, the brother of Epeios, having slain Apis, son of Phorōneus, was compelled to flee from the country: he crossed the Corinthian gulf and settled in the territory then called Kurētis, but to which he gave the name of Ætōlia.²

The son of Eleios,—or, according to other accounts, of the god Hēlios, of Poseidōn, or of Phorbas,³—is Augeas, whom we find mentioned in the Iliad as king of the Epeians or Eleians. Augeas was rich in all sorts of rural wealth, and possessed herds of cattle so numerous, that the dung of the animals accumulated in the stable or cattle-enclosures beyond all power of endurance. Eurystheus, as an insult to Hēraklēs, imposed upon him the obligation of cleansing this stable: the hero, disdaining to carry off the dung upon his shoulders, turned the course of the river Alpheios through the building, and thus swept the encumbrance away.⁴ But Augeas, in spite of so signal a service, refused to Hēraklēs the promised

¹ Theocrit. iii. 49; xx. 35; where, however, Endymiōn is connected with Latmos in Karia (see Schol. *ad loc.*).

² Pausan. v. 1. 3-6; Apollodōr. i. 7, 6.

³ Apollodōr. ii. 5, 5; Schol. Apol. Rhod. i. 172. In all probability, the old legend made Augeas the son of the god Hēlios: Hēlios, Augeas and Agamēdē are a triple series parallel to the Corinthian genealogy, Hēlios, Ætēs and Médea; not to mention that the etymology of Augeas connects him with Hēlios. Theocritus (xx. 55) designates him as the son of the god Hēlios, through whose favour his cattle are made to prosper and multiply with such astonishing success (xx. 117).

⁴ Diodōr. iv. 13. “Τρέψως ἔνεκεν Εύρυσθεύς προσέταξε καθῆραι· δε δὲ Ἡρακλῆς τὸ μὲν τοῖς ὄμοις ἔξενεγκεῖν αὐτὴν ἀπεδοκίμασεν, ἐκκλίνων τὴν ἐκ τῆς θύρεως αἰσχύνην, &c. (Pausan. v. 1, 7; Apollodōr. ii. 5, 5.)

It may not be improper to remark that this fable indicates a purely pastoral condition, or at least a singularly rude state of agriculture; and the way in which Pausanias recounts it goes even beyond the genuine story; ὡς καὶ τὰ πολλὰ τῆς χώρας αὐτῷ ἡδη διατελεῖν ἄργα δύτα ὑπὸ τῶν βοσκημάτων τῆς κόπρου. The slaves of Odysseus however know what use to make of the dung heaped before his outer fence (Odyss. xvii. 299); not so the purely carnivorous and pastoral Cyclōps (Odyss. ix. 329). The stabling, into which the cattle go from their pasture, is called *κόπρος* in

reward, though his son Phyleus protested against such treachery, and when he found that he could not induce his father to keep faith, retired in sorrow and wrath to the island of Dulichiôn.¹ To avenge the deceit practised upon him, Héraklês invaded Elis; but Augeas had powerful auxiliaries, especially his nephews, the two Molionids (sons of Poseidôn by Molionê, the wife of Aktôr), Eurytos and Kteatos. These two miraculous brothers, of transcendent force, grew together,—having one body, but two heads and four arms.² Such was their irresistible might, that Héraklês was defeated and repelled from Elis: but presently the Eleians sent the two Molionid brothers as *Theôri* (sacred envoys) to the Isthmian games, and Héraklês, placing himself in ambush at Kleônae, surprised and killed them as they passed through. For this murderous act the Eleians in vain endeavoured to obtain redress both at Corinth and at Argos; which is assigned as the reason for the self-ordained exclusion, prevalent throughout all the historical age, that no Eleian athlète would ever present himself as a competitor at the Isthmian games.³ The Molionids being thus removed, Héraklês again invaded Elis, and killed Augeas along with his children,—all except Phyleus, whom he brought over from Dulichiôn, and put in possession of his father's kingdom. According to the more gentle narrative which Pausanias adopts, Augeas was not killed, but pardoned at the request of Phyleus.⁴ He was worshipped as a hero⁵ even down to the time of that author.

Homer,—'Ελθοῦσας ἐς κόπρον, ἐπὴν βοτάνης κορέσωνται (*Odyss.* x. 411): compare *Iliad*, xviii. 575.—Μυκηθμῷ δ' ἀπὸ κόπρου ἐπεσσεύοντο πέδουνδε.

The Augeas of Theocritus has abundance of wheat-land and vineyard, as well as cattle: he ploughs his land three or four times, and digs his vineyard diligently (xx. 20-32).

¹ The wrath and retirement of Phyleus is mentioned in the *Iliad* (ii. 633), but not the cause of it.

² These singular properties were ascribed to them both in the Hesiodic poems and by Pherekydês (Schol. Ven. ad Il. xi. 715-750, et ad Il. xxii. 638), but not in the *Iliad*. The poet Ibykus (Fragm. II, Schneid. ap. Athenæ. ii. 57) calls them ἀλικαὶ ἴσοκεφάλους, ἐνιγυλούς, Ἀμφοτέρους γεγαῶτας ἐν ὀέφ ἀργυρέφ.

There were temples and divine honours to Zeus Molion (Lactantius, *de Falsâ Religione*, i. 22).

³ Pausan. v. 2, 4. The inscription cited by Pausanias proves that this was the reason assigned by the Eleian athlètes themselves for the exclusion; but there were several different stories.

⁴ Apollodôr. ii. 7, 2. Diodôr. iv. 33. Pausan. v. 2, 2; 3, 2. It seems evident from these accounts that the genuine legend represented Héraklês as having been defeated by the Molionids: the unskillful evasions both of Apollodôrus and Diodôrus betray this. Pindar (*Olymp.* xi. 25-50) gives the story without any flattery to Héraklês.

⁵ Pausan. v. 4, 1.

It was on occasion of this conquest of Elis, according to the old mythe which Pindar has ennobled in a magnificent ode, that Héraplés first consecrated the ground of Olympia and established the Olympic games. Such at least was one of the many fables respecting the origin of that memorable institution.¹

It has already been mentioned that Aëtolus, son of Endymiôn, quitted Peloponnêsus in consequence of having slain Apis.² The country on the north of the Corinthian gulf, between the rivers Euénus and Achelôus, received from him the name of Aëtolia, instead of that of Kurêtis: he acquired possession of it after having slain Dôrus, Laodokus, and Polypôetes, sons of Apollo and Phthia, by whom he had been well received. He had by his wife Pronoê (the daughter of Phorbas,) two sons, Pleurôn and Kalydôn, and from them the two chief towns in Aëtolia were named.³ Pleurôn married Xanthippê, daughter of Dôrus, and had for his son Agénôr, from whom sprang Portheus, or Porthaôn, and Demonikê: Euênos and Thestius were children of the latter by the god Arés.⁴

Portheus had three sons, Agrius, Melas and Cœneus: among the offspring of Thestius were Althaea and Léda,⁵—names which bring us to a period of interest in the legendary history.

¹ The Armenian copy of Eusebius gives a different genealogy respecting Elis and Pisa: Aëthlius, Epeius, Endymiôn, Alexinus; next Cœnomaus and Pélops, then Héraplés. Some counted *ten* generations, others *three*, between Héraplés and Iphitus, who renewed the discontinued Olympic games (see Armen. Euseb. copy. c. xxxii. p. 140).

² Ephorus said that Aëtolus had been expelled by Salmoneus king of the Epeians and Pisatæ (ap. Strabo, viii. p. 357): he must have had before him a different story and different genealogy from that which is given in the text.

³ Apollodôr. i. 7, 6. Dôrus, son of Apollo and Phthia, killed by Aëtolus, after having hospitably received him, is here mentioned. Nothing at all is known of this; but the conjunction of names is such as to render it probable that there was some legend connected with them: possibly the assistance given by Apollo to the Kurêtes against the Aëtolians, and the death of Meleager by the hand of Apollo, related both in the Eoiai and the Minyas (Pausan. x. 31, 2), may have been grounded upon it. The story connects itself with what is stated by Apollodôrus about Dôrus son of Hellén.

⁴ According to the ancient genealogical poet Asius, Thestius was son of Agénôr the son of Pleurôn (Asii Fragm. 6, p. 413, ed. Marktsch.). Compare the genealogy of Aëtolia and the general remarks upon it, in Brandstäter, Geschichte des Aëtol. Landes, &c., Berlin, 1844, p. 23 *seg.*

⁵ Respecting Léda, see the statements of Ibykus, Pherekydés, Hellanikus, &c. (Schol. Apollôn. Rhod. i. 146). The reference to the Corinthiaca of Eumélus is curious: it is a specimen of the matters upon which these old genealogical poems dwelt.

Lêda marries Tyndareus and becomes mother of Helena and the Dioskuri: Althæa marries Æneus, and has, among other children, Meleager and Deianeira; the latter being begotten by the god Dionysus, and the former by Arés.¹ Tydeus also is his son, the father of Diomédès: warlike eminence goes hand in hand with tragic calamity among the members of this memorable family.

We are fortunate enough to find the legend of Althæa and Meleager set forth at considerable length in the Iliad, in the speech addressed by Phœnix to appease the wrath of Achilles. Æneus, king of Kalydôn, in the vintage sacrifices which he offered to the gods, omitted to include Artemis: the misguided man either forgot her or cared not for her;² and the goddess, provoked by such an insult, sent against the vineyards of Æneus a wild boar of vast size and strength, who tore up the trees by the root, and laid prostrate all their fruit. So terrible was this boar, that nothing less than a numerous body of men could venture to attack him: Meleager, the son of Æneus, however, having got together a considerable number of companions, partly from the Kurêtes of Pleurôn, at length slew him. But the anger of Artemis was not yet appeased. She raised a dispute among the combatants respecting the possession of the boar's head and hide—the trophies of victory. In this dispute Meleager slew the brother of his mother Althæa, prince of the Kurêtes of Pleurôn: these Kurêtes attacked the Ætolians of Kalydôn in order to avenge their chief. So long as Meleager contended in the field the Ætolians had the superiority. But he presently refused to come forth, indignant at the curses imprecated upon him by his mother. For Althæa, wrung with sorrow for the death of her brother, flung herself upon the ground in tears, beat the earth violently with her hands, and implored Hadès and Persephonê to inflict death upon Meleager,—a prayer which the unrelenting Erinnyses in Erebus heard but too well. So keenly did the hero resent this behaviour of his mother, that he kept aloof from the war. Accordingly the Kurêtes not only drove the Ætolians from the field, but assailed the walls and gates of Kalydôn, and were on the point of overwhelming its dismayed inhabitants. There was

¹ Apollodôr. i. 8, 1; Euripidês, Meleager, Frag. 1. The three sons of Portheus are named in the Iliad (xiv. 116) as living at Pleurôn and Kalydôn. The name Æneus doubtless brings Dionysus into the legend.

² *Ἡ λάθετ', οὐκ ἐνδησεν· ἀδσπατο δὲ μέγα θυμῷ* (Iliad, ix. 533). The destructive influence of Até is mentioned before, v. 502. The piety of Xenophon reproduces this ancient circumstance,—*Οἰνευς δὲ ἐν γῆρᾳ ἐπιλαθουένου τῆς θεοῦ*, &c. (De Venat. c. 1).

no hope of safety except in the arm of Meleager ; but Meleager lay in his chamber by the side of his beautiful wife Kleopatra, the daughter of Idas, and heeded not the necessity. While the shouts of expected victory were heard from the assailants at the gates, the ancient men of *Ætolia* and the priests of the gods earnestly besought Meleager to come forth,¹ offering him his choice of the fattest land in the plain of Kalydōn. His dearest friends, his father *Œneus*, his sisters, and even his mother herself, added their supplications—but he remained inflexible. At length the Kurētes penetrated into the town and began to burn it : at this last moment, Kleopatra his wife addressed to him her pathetic appeal, to avert from her and from his family the desperate horrors impending over them all. Meleager could no longer resist : he put on his armour, went forth from his chamber, and repelled the enemy. But when the danger was over, his countrymen withheld from him the splendid presents which they had promised, because he had rejected their prayers, and had come forth only when his own haughty caprice dictated.²

Such is the legend of Meleager in the *Iliad* : a verse in the second book mentions simply the death of Meleager, without farther details, as a reason why Thoas appeared in command of the *Ætolians* before Troy.³

Later poets both enlarged and altered the fable. The Hesiodic *Eoiai*, as well as the old poem called the *Minyas*, represented Meleager as having been slain by Apollo, who aided the Kurētes in the war ; and the incident of the burning brand, though quite at variance with Homer, is at least as old as the tragic poet *Phrynicus*, earlier than *Æschylus*.⁴ The Moeræ, or Fates, presenting themselves to Althæa shortly after the birth of Meleager, predicted that the child would die so soon as the brand then burning on the fire near at hand should be consumed. Althæa snatched it from the flames and extinguished it, preserving it with the utmost care, until she became incensed against Meleager for the death of her brother. She then cast it into the fire, and as soon as it was consumed the life of Meleager was brought to a close.

We know from the censure of Pliny, that Sophoklēs heightened the pathos of this subject by his account of the mournful death of Meleager's sisters, who perished from excess

¹ These priests formed the Chorus in the Meleager of Sophoklēs (Schol. ad *Iliad.* ix. 575).

² *Iliad.* ix. 525-595.

³ *Iliad.* ii. 642.

⁴ *Pausan.* x. 31, 2. The *Πλευρώνιατ*, a lost tragedy of *Phrynicus*.

of grief. They were changed into the birds called Meleagrides, and their never-ceasing tears ran together into amber.¹ But in the hands of Euripidēs—whether originally through him or not,² we cannot tell—Atalanta became the prominent figure and motive of the piece, while the party convened to hunt the Kalydōnian boar was made to comprise all the distinguished heroes from every quarter of Greece. In fact, as Heyne justly remarks, this event is one of the four aggregate dramas of Grecian heroic life,³ along with the Argonautic expedition, the siege of Thēbes, and the Trojan war.

To accomplish the destruction of the terrific animal which Artemis in her wrath had sent forth, Meleager assembled not merely the choice youth among the Kurētes and *Ætolians* (as we find in the Iliad), but an illustrious troop, including Kastōr and Pollux, Idas and Lynkeus, Pēleus and Telamōn, Thēseus and Peirithous, Ankæus and Kēpheus, Jasōn, Amphiaraus, Admētus, Eurytiōn and others. Nestōr and Phœnix, who appear as old men before the walls of Troy, exhibited their early prowess as auxiliaries to the suffering Kalydōnians.⁴ Conspicuous amidst them all stood the virgin Atalanta, daughter of the Arcadian Schoeneus; beautiful and matchless for swiftness of foot, but living in the forest as a huntress and unacceptable to Aphroditē.⁵ Several of the heroes were slain by the boar; others escaped, by various stratagems: at length Atalanta first shot him in the back, next Amphiaraus in the eye, and, lastly, Meleager killed him. Enamoured of the

¹ Plin. H. N. xxxvii. 2, 11.

² There was a tragedy of *Æschylus* called 'Αταλάντη, of which nothing remains (Bothe, *Æschyli Fragm.* ix. p. 18).

Of the more recent dramatic writers, several selected Atalanta as their subject (see Brandstäter, *Geschichte Ætoliens*, p. 65).

³ There was a poem of Stesichorus, Συοθῆραι (Stesichor. *Fragm.* 15, p. 72).

⁴ The catalogue of these heroes is in Apollodōr. i. 8, 2; Ovid, *Metamor.* viii. 300; Hygin. fab. 173. Euripidēs, in his play of Meleager, gave an enumeration and description of the heroes (see *Fragm.* 6 of that play, ed. Matth.). Nestōr, in this picture of Ovid, however, does not appear quite so invincible as in his own speeches in the Iliad. The mythographers thought it necessary to assign a reason why Hēraklēs was *not* present at the Kalydōnian adventure: he was just at that time in servitude with Omphalē in Lydia (Apollod. ii. 6, 3). This seems to have been the idea of Ephorus, and it is much in his style of interpretation (see Ephor. *Fragm.* 9, ed. Didot).

⁵ Euripid. *Meleag.* *Fragm.* vi. Matt.—

Κύπριδος δὲ μίσημ', Ἀρκὰς 'Αταλάντη, κύνας
Καὶ τόξ' ἔχουσα, &c.

There was a drama "Meleager" both of Sophoklēs and Euripidēs: of the former hardly any fragments remain,—a few more of the latter.

beauty of Atalanta, Meleager made over to her the chief spoils of the animal, on the plea that she had inflicted the first wound. But his uncles, the brothers of Theseus, took them away from her, asserting their rights as next of kin,¹ if Meleager declined to keep the prize for himself: the latter, exasperated at this behaviour, slew them. Althaea, in deep sorrow for her brothers and wrath against her son, is impelled to produce the fatal brand which she had so long treasured up, and consign it to the flames.² The tragedy concludes with the voluntary death both of Althaea and Kleopatra.

Interesting as the Arcadian huntress, Atalanta, is in herself, she is an intrusion, and not a very convenient intrusion, into the Homeric story of the Kalydonian boar-hunt, wherein another female, Kleopatra, already occupied the fore-ground. But the more recent version became accredited throughout Greece, and was sustained by evidence which few persons in those days felt any inclination to controvert. For Atalanta carried away with her the spoils and head of the boar into Arcadia; and there for successive centuries hung the identical hide and the gigantic tusks, of three feet in length, in the temple of Athénê Alea at Tegea. Kallimachus mentions them as being there preserved, in the third century before the Christian æra;³ but the extraordinary value set upon them is best proved by the fact that the emperor Augustus took away the tusks from Tegea, along with the great statue of Athénê Alea, and conveyed them to Rome, to be there preserved among the public curiosities. Even a century and a half afterwards, when Pausanias visited Greece, the skin worn out with age was shown to him, while the robbery of the tusks had not been forgotten. Nor were these relics of the boar the only memento preserved at Tegea of the heroic enterprise. On the pediment of the temple of Athénê Alea, unparalleled in Peloponnesus for beauty and grandeur, the illustrious statuary Skopas had executed one of his most finished reliefs, representing the Kalydonian hunt. Atalanta and Meleager were placed in the front rank of the assailants: while Ankæus, one of the Tegean heroes, to whom the tusks of the boar had proved

¹ Hyginus, fab. 229.

² Diodor. iv. 34. Apollodorus (i. 8; 2-4) gives first the usual narrative, including Atalanta; next, the Homeric narrative with some additional circumstances, but not including either Atalanta or the fire-brand on which Meleager's life depended.

³ Kallimachus, Hymn. ad Dian. 217—

Οὐ μιν ἐπίκλητοι Καλυδώνιοι ἀγρευτῆρες
Μέμφονται κάπροιο τὰ γάρ σημῆνα νίκης
Ἀρκαδίην εἰσῆλθεν, ἔχει δὲ ἐτί θηρὸς ὁδόντας.

fatal,¹ was represented as sinking under his death-wound into the arms of his brother Epochos. And Pausanias observes, that the Tegeans, while they had manifested the same honourable forwardness as other Arcadian communities in the conquest of Troy, the repulse of Xerxēs, and the battle of Dipæa against Sparta—might fairly claim to themselves, through Ankæus and Atalanta, that they alone amongst all Arcadians had participated in the glory of the Kalydōnian boar-hunt.² So entire and unsuspecting is the faith both of the Tegeans and of Pausanias in the past historical reality of this romantic adventure. Strabo indeed tries to transform the romance into something which has the outward semblance of history, by remarking that the quarrel respecting the boar's head and hide cannot have been the real cause of war between the Kurētes and the Ætōlians; the true ground of dispute (he contends) was probably the possession of a portion of territory.³ His remarks on this head are analogous to those of Thucydidēs and other critics, when they ascribe the Trojan war, not to the rape of Helen, but to views of conquest or political apprehensions. But he treats the general fact of the battle between the Kurētes and the Ætōlians, mentioned in the Iliad, as something unquestionably real and historical—recapitulating at the same time a variety of discrepancies on the part of different authors, but not giving any decision of his own respecting their truth or falsehood.

In the same manner as Atalanta was intruded into the Kalydōnian hunt, so also she seems to have been introduced into the memorable funeral games celebrated after the decease of Pelias at Iōlkos, in which she had no place at the time when

¹ See Pherekyd. Frag. 81, ed. Didot.

² Pausan. viii. 45, 4; 46, 1-3; 47, 2. Lucian, adv. Indoctum, c. 14, t. iii. p. 111, Reiz.

The officers placed in charge of the public curiosities or wonders at Rome (*οἱ ἐπὶ τοῖς θαύμασιν*) affirmed that one of the tusks had been accidentally broken in the voyage from Greece; the other was kept in the temple of Bacchus in the Imperial Gardens.

It is numbered among the memorable exploits of Thēseus that he vanquished and killed a formidable and gigantic sow, in the territory of Krommyōn near Corinth. According to some critics, this Krommyōnian sow was the mother of the Kalydōnian boar (Strabo, viii. p. 380).

³ Strabo, x. p. 466. Πολέμου δὲ ἐμπεσόντος τοῖς Θεσπιαῖς πρὸς Οἰνέα καὶ Μελέαγρον, δέ μὲν Ποιητὴς, ἀμφὶ σύνδεσι κεφαλῆς καὶ δέρματι, κατὰ τὴν περὶ τοῦ κάπρου μυθολογίαν· ὡς δέ τὸ εἶκός, περὶ μέρους τῆς χώρας, &c. This remark is also similar to Mr. Payne Knight's criticism on the true causes of the Trojan war, which were (he tells us) of a political character, independent of Helen and her abduction (Prolegom. ad Homer. c. 53).

the works on the chest of Kypselus were executed.¹ But her native and genuine locality is Arcadia; where her race-course, near to the town of Methydrion, was shown even in the days of Pausanias.² This race-course had been the scene of destruction for more than one unsuccessful suitor. For Atalanta, averse to marriage, had proclaimed that her hand should only be won by the competitor who would surpass her in running: all who tried and failed were condemned to die, and many were the persons to whom her beauty and swiftness, alike unparalleled, had proved fatal. At length Meilaniōn, who had vainly tried to win her affections by assiduous services in her hunting excursions, ventured to enter the perilous lists. Aware that he could not hope to outrun her except by stratagem, he had obtained, by the kindness of Aphroditē, three golden apples from the garden of the Hesperides, which he successively let fall near to her while engaged in the race. The maiden could not resist the temptation of picking them up, and was thus overcome: she became the wife of Meilaniōn, and the mother of the Arcadian Parthenopaeus, one of the seven chiefs who perished in the siege of Thêbes.³

¹ Compare Apollodôr. iii. 9. 2, and Pausan. v. 17, 4. She is made to wrestle with Pêleus at these funeral games, which seems foreign to her character.

² Pausan. viii. 35, 8.

³ Respecting the varieties in this interesting story, see Apollod. iii. 9, 2; Hygin. f. 185; Ovid. Metam. x. 560-700; Propert. i. 1, 20; Aelian V. H. xiii. i. Μειλανίωνος σωφρούέστερος. Aristophan. Lysistrat. 786 and Schol. In the ancient representation on the chest of Kypselus (Paus. v. 19, 1), Meilaniōn was exhibited standing near Atalanta, who was holding a fawn: no match or competition in running was indicated.

There is great discrepancy in the naming and patronymic description of the parties in the story. Three different persons are announced as fathers of Atalanta, Schoeneus, Jasus and Mænalous; the successful lover in Ovid (and seemingly in Euripidês also) is called Hippomenês, not Meilaniōn. In the Hesiodic poems Atalanta was daughter of Schoeneus; Hellanikus called her daughter of Jasus. See Apollodôr. l. c.; Kallimach. Hymn to Dian. 214, with the note of Spanheim; Schol. Eurip. Phœniss. 150; Schol. Theocr. Idyll. iii. 40; also the ample commentary of Bachel de Meziriac, sur les Epîtres d'Ovide, vol. i. p. 366. Servius (ad Virg. Eclog. vi. 61; Aeneid, iii. 113) calls Atalanta a native of Skyros.

Both the ancient scholiasts (see Schol. Apoll. Rhod. i. 769) and the modern commentators, Spanheim and Heyne, seek to escape this difficulty by supposing two Atalantas,—an Arcadian and a Bœôtian; assuming the principle of their conjecture to be admissible, they ought to suppose at least three.

Certainly, if personages of the Grecian mythes are to be treated as historically real, and their adventures as so many exaggerated or miscoloured facts, it will be necessary to repeat the process of multiplying entities to an infinite extent. And this is one among the many reasons for rejecting the fundamental supposition.

We have yet another female in the family of Cœneus, whose name the legend has immortalised. His daughter Deianeira was sought in marriage by the river Achelôus, who presented himself in various shapes, first as a serpent and afterwards as a bull. From the importunity of this hateful suitor she was rescued by the arrival of Héraklês, who encountered Achelôus, vanquished him and broke off one of his horns, which Achelôus ransomed by surrendering to him the horn of Amaltheia, endued with the miraculous property of supplying the possessor with abundance of any food and drink which he desired. Héraklês being rewarded for his prowess by the possession of Deianeira, made over the horn of Amaltheia as his marriage-present to Cœneus.¹ Compelled to leave the residence of Cœneus, in consequence of having in a fit of anger struck the youthful attendant Eunomus, and involuntarily killed him,² Héraklês retired to Trachin, crossing the river Euénus at the place where the Centaur Nessus was accustomed to carry over passengers for hire. Nessus carried over Deianeira, but when he had arrived on the other side, began to treat her with rudeness, upon which Héraklês slew him with an arrow tinged by

But when we consider these personages as purely legendary, so that an historical basis can neither be affirmed nor denied respecting them, we escape the necessity of such inconvenient stratagems. The test of identity is then to be sought in the attributes, not in the legal description,—in the predicates, not in the subject. Atalanta, whether born of one father or another, whether belonging to one place or another, is beautiful, cold, repulsive, daring, swift of foot and skilful with the bow,—these attributes constitute her identity. The Scholiast on Theocritus (iii. 40), in vindicating his supposition that there were two Atalantas, draws a distinction founded upon this very principle: he says that the Bœotian Atalanta was *τρογοτίς*, and the Arcadian Atalanta *δρόμαια*. But this seems an over-refinement: both the shooting and the running go to constitute an accomplished huntress.

In respect to Partienopæus, called by Euripidês and by so many others the son of Atalanta, it is of some importance to add, that Apollodôrus, Aristarchus, and Antimachus, the author of the Thebaid, assigned to him a pedigree entirely different,—making him an Argeian, the son of Talao and Lysimaché, and brother of Adrastus. (Apollodôr. i. 9, 13; Aristarch. ap. Schol. Soph. Ed. Col. 1320; Antimachus ap. Schol. Aeschyl. Sep. Theb. 532; and Schol. Supplm. ad Eurip. Phœniss. t. viii. p. 461, ed. Matth. Apollodôrus is in fact inconsistent with himself in another passage.)

¹ Sophokl. Trachin. 7. The horn of Amaltheia was described by Pherekydês (Apollod. ii. 7, 5): see also Strabo, x. p. 458, and Diodôr. iv. 35, who cites an interpretation of the fables (*οἱ εἰκάσοντες ἐξ αὐτῶν τὰ ληθέας*) to the effect that it was symbolical of an embankment of the unruly river by Héraklês, and consequent recovery of very fertile land.

² Hellanikus (ap. Athen. ix. p. 410) mentioning this incident, in two different works, called the attendant by two different names.

the poison of the Lernæan hydra. The dying Centaur advised Deianeira to preserve the poisoned blood which flowed from his wound, telling her that it would operate as a philtre to regain for her the affections of Héraklēs, in case she should ever be threatened by a rival. Some time afterwards the hero saw and loved the beautiful Iolē, daughter of Eurytos, king of Æchalia: he stormed the town, killed Eurytos, and made Iolē his captive. The misguided Deianeira now had recourse to her supposed philtre: she sent as a present to Héraklēs a splendid tunic, imbued secretly with the poisoned blood of the Centaur. Héraklēs adorned himself with the tunic on the occasion of offering a solemn sacrifice to Zeus on the promontory of Kēnæon in Eubœa: but the fatal garment, when once put on, clung to him indissolubly, burnt his skin and flesh, and occasioned an agony of pain from which he was only relieved by death. Deianeira slew herself in despair at this disastrous catastrophe.¹

We have not yet exhausted the eventful career of Æneus and his family—ennobled among the Ætōlians especially, both by religious worship and by poetical eulogy—and favourite themes not merely in some of the Hesiodic poems, but also in other

¹ The beautiful drama of the Trachiniæ has rendered this story familiar: compare Apollod. ii. 7, 7. Hygin. f. 36. Diodōr. iv. 36–37.

The capture of Æchalia (*Οἰχαλίας ἄλωσις*) was celebrated in a very ancient epic poem by Kreophylos, of the Homeric and not of the Hesiodic character; it passed with many as the work of Homer himself. (See Dūntzer, Fragm. Epic. Græcor. p. 8. Welcker, *Der Epische Cyclus*, p. 229.) The same subject was also treated in the Hesiodic Catalogue, or in the Eoiai (see Hesiod, Fragm. 129, ed. Marktsch.): the number of the children of Eurytos was there enumerated.

This exploit seems constantly mentioned as the last performed by Héraklēs, and as immediately preceding his death or apotheosis on Mount Cēta: but whether the legend of Deianeira and the poisoned tunic be very old, we cannot tell.

The tale of the death of Iphitos, son of Eurytos, by Héraklēs, is as ancient as the *Odyssey* (xxi. 19–40): but it is there stated, that Eurytos dying left his memorable bow to his son Iphitos (the bow is given afterwards by Iphitos to Odysseus, and is the weapon so fatal to the suitors),—a statement not very consistent with the story that Æchalia was taken and Eurytos slain by Héraklēs. It is plain that these were distinct and contradictory legends. Compare Soph. *Trachin.* 260–285 (where Iphitos dies before Eurytos), not only with the passage just cited from the *Odyssey*, but also with Pherekydēs, Fragm. 34, Didot.

Hyginus (f. 33) differs altogether in the parentage of Deianeira: he calls her daughter of Dexamenos: his account of her marriage with Héraklēs is in every respect at variance with Apollodōrus. In the latter, Mēsimachē is the daughter of Dexamenos; Héraklēs rescues her from the importunities of the Centaur Eurytiōn (ii. 5, 5).

ancient epic productions, the Alkmæðnis and the Cyclic Thébais.¹ By another marriage, Æneus had for his son Tydeus, whose poetical celebrity is attested by the many different accounts given both of the name and condition of his mother. Tydeus, having slain his cousins, the sons of Melas, who were conspiring against Æneus, was forced to become an exile, and took refuge at Argos with Adrastus, whose daughter Deipylié he married. The issue of this marriage was Diomédès, whose brilliant exploits in the siege of Troy were not less celebrated than those of his father at the siege of Thébes. After the departure of Tydeus, Æneus was deposed by the sons of Agrios. He fell into extreme poverty and wretchedness, from which he was only rescued by his grandson Diomédès, after the conquest of Troy.² The sufferings of this ancient warrior, and the final restoration and revenge by Diomédès, were the subject of a lost tragedy of Euripidès, which even the ridicule of Aristophanès demonstrates to have been eminently pathetic.³

Though the genealogy just given of Æneus is in part Homeric, and seems to have been followed generally by the mythographers, yet we find another totally at variance with it in Hekatæus, which he doubtless borrowed from some of the old poets: the simplicity of the story annexed to it seems to attest its antiquity. Orestheus, son of Deukaliôn, first passed into Ætolia, and acquired the kingdom: he was father of Phytios, who was father of Æneus. Ætôlus was son of Æneus.⁴

The original migration of Ætôlus from Elis to Ætolia—and the subsequent establishment in Elis of Oxylus, his descendant in the tenth generation, along with the Dôrian invaders of Peloponnêsus—were commemorated by two inscriptions, one in the agora of Elis, the other in that of the Ætolian chief town, Thermum, engraved upon the statues of Ætôlus and Oxylus⁵ respectively.

¹ See the references in Apollod. i. 8, 4-5. Pindar, Isthm. iv. 32. Μελέταν δὲ σοφιστᾶς Δίδος ἔκατι πρόσβαλον σεβιζόμενοι. Ἐν μὲν Αἰτωλῶν θυσίαισι φαεννᾶς Οἰνεῖδαι κρατερός, &c.

² Hekat. Frigm. 341, Didot. In this story Æneus is connected with the first discovery of the vine and the making of wine (*olbos*): compare Hygin. f. 129, and Servius ad Virgil. Georgic. i. 9.

³ See Welcker (Griechisch. Tragöd. ii. p. 583) on the lost tragedy called Æneus.

⁴ Timoklês, Comic. ap. Athenæ. vii. p. 223—

Γέρων τις ἀτυχεῖ; κατέμαθεν τὸν Οἰνέα.

Ovid, Heroid. ix. 153—

“Heu! devota domus! Solio sedet Agrios alto:
Ænea desertum nuda senecta premit.”

⁵ Ephor. Frigm. 29, Didot ap. Strab. x.

CHAPTER VII

THE PELOPIDS

AMONG the ancient legendary genealogies there was none which figured with greater splendour, or which attracted to itself a higher degree of poetical interest and pathos, than that of the Pelopids—Tantalus, Pelops, Atreus and Thyestes, Agamemnon and Menelaus and Aegisthus, Helen and Clytemnestra, Orestes and Elektra and Hermione. Each of these characters is a star of the first magnitude in the Grecian hemisphere: each name suggests the idea of some interesting romance or some harrowing tragedy: the curse, which taints the family from the beginning, inflicts multiplied wounds at every successive generation. So, at least, the story of the Pelopids presents itself, after it had been successively expanded and decorated by epic, lyric, and tragic poets. It will be sufficient to touch briefly upon events with which every reader of Grecian poetry is more or less familiar, and to offer some remarks upon the way in which they were coloured and modified by different Grecian authors.

Pelops is the eponym or name-giver of the Peloponnese: to find an eponym for every conspicuous local name was the invariable turn of Grecian retrospective fancy. The name Peloponnese is not to be found either in the Iliad or the Odyssey, nor any other denomination which can be attached distinctly and specially to the entire peninsula. But we meet with the name in one of the most ancient post-Homeric poems of which any fragments have been preserved—the Cyprian Verses—a poem which many (seemingly most persons) even of the contemporaries of Herodotus ascribed to the author of the Iliad, though Herodotus contradicts the opinion.¹ The attributes by which the Pelopid Agamemnon and his house are marked out and distinguished from the other heroes of the

¹ Herod., ii. 117. Fragment. Epicc. Græc. Dünzter, ix. Κύπρια, 8—

Αἴγα τε Λυγκεῖς
Ταύγετον προσβαίνε ποσὶν ταχέσσοι πεποιθὼς,
'Ακρότατον δ' ἀναβάς διεδέρκετο νῆσον ἄπασαν
Ταυταλίδεω Πέλοπος.

Also the Homeric Hymn. Apoll. 419, 430, and Tyrtæus, Fragm. 1—

(Εὐνομία)—Εὐρεῖαν Πέλοπος νῆσον ἀφικόμεθα.

The Schol. ad Iliad. ix. 246, intimates that the name Πελοπόννησος occurred in one or more of the Hesiodic epics.

Iliad, are precisely those which Grecian imagination would naturally seek in an eponymus—superior wealth, power, splendour, and régality. Not only Agamemnôn himself, but his brother Menelaus, is “more of a king” even than Nestôr or Diomêdês. The gods have not given to the king of the “much-golden” Mykênae greater courage, or strength, or ability, than to various other chiefs; but they have conferred upon him a marked superiority in riches, power, and dignity, and have thus singled him out as the appropriate leader of the forces.¹ He enjoys this pre-eminence as belonging to a privileged family and as inheriting the heaven-descended sceptre of Pelops, the transmission of which is described by Homer in a very remarkable way. The sceptre was made “by Hêphæstos, who presented it to Zeus; Zeus gave it to Hermês, Hermês to the charioteer Pelops; Pelops gave it to Atreus, the ruler of men; Atreus at his death left it to Thyestês, the rich cattle-owner; Thyestês in his turn left it to his nephew Agamemnôn to carry, that he might hold dominion over many islands and over all Argos.”²

We have here the unrivalled wealth and power of the “king of men, Agamemnôn,” traced up to his descent from Pelops, and accounted for, in harmony with the recognised epical agencies, by the present of the special sceptre of Zeus through the hands of Hermês; the latter being the wealth-giving god, whose blessing is most efficacious in furthering the process of acquisition, whether by theft or by accelerated multiplication of flocks and herds.³ The wealth and princely character of the

¹ Iliad, ix. 37. Compare ii. 580. Diomêdês addresses Agamemnôn—

Σοὶ δὲ διάνδιχα δῶκε Κρόνου παῖς ἀγυνλομήτεω.
Σκῆπτρω μέν τοι δῶκε τετιμῆσθαι περὶ πάντων·
'Αλκὴν δ' οὐ τοι δῶκεν, ὃ τε κράτος ἔστι μέγιστον.

A similar contrast is drawn by Nestôr (Il. i. 280) between Agamemnôn and Achilles. Nestôr says to Agamemnôn (Il. ix. 69)—

'Ατρείδη, σὺ μὲν ἄρχε· σὺ γὰρ βασιλεύτατός ἐστι.

And this attribute attaches to Menelaus as well as to his brother. For when Diomêdês is about to choose his companion for the night expedition into the Trojan camp, Agamemnôn thus addresses him (x. 232)—

Τὸν μὲν δὴ ἔταρόν γ' αἰρήσει, ὃν κ' ἔθέλησθα
Φαινομένων τὸν ἄριστον, ἐπεὶ μερίασί γε τολλοί·
Μῆδος σὺ γ' αἰδόμενος σῆσος φρεΐ, τὸν μὲν ἄρειω
Καλλείπειν, σὺ δὲ χειρὸν ὀπάσσεαι αἰδοὶ εἰκων,
'Ες γενεὴν ὄρσων, εἰ καὶ βασιλεύτερός ἐστιν.
Ὄς ἐφάτ, ἔδεισε δὲ περὶ ξανθῷ Μενελάφ.

² Iliad, ii. 101.

³ Iliad, xiv. 491. Hesiod, Theog. 444. Homer, Hymn. Mercur. 526-568. Ολβαν καὶ πλούτου δῶσω περικαλλέα ράβδον. Compare Eustath. ad Iliad. xvi. 182.

Atreids were proverbial among the ancient epic poets. Paris not only carries away Helen, but much property along with her :¹ the house of Menelaus, when Tēlemachus visits it in the Odyssey, is so resplendent with gold and silver and rare ornament,² as to strike the beholder with astonishment and admiration. The attributes assigned to Tantalus, the father of Pelops, are in conformity with the general idea of the family—superhuman abundance and enjoyments, and intimate converse with the gods, to such a degree that his head is turned, and he commits inexpiable sin. But though Tantalus himself is mentioned, in one of the most suspicious passages of the Odyssey (as suffering punishment in the under-world), he is not announced, nor is any one else announced, as father of Pelops, unless we are to construe the lines in the Iliad as implying that the latter was son of Hermēs. In the conception of the author of the Iliad, the Pelopids are, if not of divine origin, at least a mortal breed specially favoured and ennobled by the gods—beginning with Pelops, and localised at Mykēnæ. No allusion is made to any connexion of Pelops either with Pisa or with Lydia.

The legend which connected Tantalus and Pelops with Mount Sipylus may probably have grown out of the Æolic settlements at Magnēsia and Kymē. Both the Lydian origin and the Pisatic sovereignty of Pelops are adapted to times later than the Iliad, when the Olympic games had acquired to themselves the general reverence of Greece, and had come to serve as the religious and recreative centre of the Peloponnēsus—and when the Lydian and Phrygian heroic names, Midas and Gygēs, were the types of wealth and luxury, as well as of chariot-driving, in the imagination of a Greek. The inconsiderable villages of the Pisatid derived their whole importance from the vicinity of Olympia: they are not deemed worthy of notice in the Catalogue of Homer. Nor could the genealogy which connected the eponym of the entire peninsula with Pisa have obtained currency in Greece unless it had been sustained by pre-established veneration for the locality of Olympia. But if the sovereign of the humble Pisa was to be recognised as

¹ Iliad, iii. 72; vii. 363. In the Hesiodic Eoiai was the following couplet (Fragm. 55, p. 43, Dūntzer)—

'Αλκήν μὲν γάρ ἔβωκεν Ολύμπιος Αἰακίδησιν,
Νοῦν δὲ Αμυθαονίδαις, πλούτον δὲ ἐπορτέατρείδησι.

Again, Tyrtæus, Fragm. 9, 4—

Οἰδεις εἰ Ταυταλίδεω Πέλοπος βασιλεύτερος εἴη, &c.

² Odyss. iv. 45-71.

forerunner of the thrice-wealthy princes of Mykēnæ, it became necessary to assign some explanatory cause of his riches. Hence the supposition of his being an immigrant, son of a wealthy Lydian named Tantalus, who was the offspring of Zeus and Ploutō. Lydian wealth and Lydian chariot-driving rendered Pelops a fit person to occupy his place in the legend, both as ruler of Pisa and progenitor of the Mykēnæan Atreids. Even with the admission of these two circumstances there is considerable difficulty, for those who wish to read the legends as consecutive history, in making the Pelopids pass smoothly and plausibly from Pisa to Mykēnæ.

I shall briefly recount the legends of this great heroic family as they came to stand in their full and ultimate growth, after the localisation of Pelops at Pisa had been tacked on as a preface to Homer's version of the Pelopid genealogy.

Tantalus, residing near Mount Sipylus in Lydia, had two children, Pelops and Niobē. He was a man of immense possessions and pre-eminent happiness, above the lot of humanity: the gods communicated with him freely, received him at their banquets, and accepted of his hospitality in return. Intoxicated with such prosperity, Tantalus became guilty of gross wickedness. He stole nectar and ambrosia from the table of the gods, and revealed their secrets to mankind: he killed and served up to them at a feast his own son Pelops. The gods were horror-struck when they discovered the meal prepared for them: Zeus restored the mangled youth to life, and as Démêtér, then absorbed in grief for the loss of her daughter Persephoné, had eaten a portion of the shoulder, he supplied an ivory shoulder in place of it. Tantalus expiated his guilt by exemplary punishment. He was placed in the under-world, with fruit and water seemingly close to him, yet eluding his touch as often as he tried to grasp them, and leaving his hunger and thirst incessant and unappeased.¹ Pindar, in a very remarkable passage, finds this old legend revolting to his feelings: he rejects the tale of the flesh of Pelops having been served up and eaten, as altogether unworthy of the gods.²

Niobē, the daughter of Tantalus, was married to Amphiōn,

¹ Diodōr. iv. 77. Hom. Odyss. xi. 582. Pindar gives a different version of the punishment inflicted on Tantalus: a vast stone was perpetually impeding over his head, and threatening to fall (Olymp. i. 56; Isth. vii. 20).

² Pindar, Olymp. i. 45. Compare the sentiment of Iphigeneia in Euripidēs, Iph. Taur. 387.

and had a numerous and flourishing offspring of seven sons and seven daughters. Though accepted as the intimate friend and companion of Léto, the mother of Apollo and Artemis,¹ she was presumptuous enough to triumph over that goddess, and to place herself on a footing of higher dignity, on account of the superior number of her children. Apollo and Artemis avenged this insult by killing all the sons and all the daughters: Niobé, thus left a childless and disconsolate mother, wept herself to death, and was turned into a rock, which the later Greeks continued always to identify on Mount Sipylos.²

Some authors represented Pelops as not being a Lydian, but a king of Paphlagônia; by others it was said that Tantalus, having become detested from his impieties, had been expelled from Asia by Ilus the king of Troy,—an incident which served the double purpose of explaining the transit of Pelops to Greece, and of imparting to the siege of Troy by Agamemnón the character of retribution for wrongs done to his ancestor.³ When Pelops came over to Greece, he found Cœnomaus, son of the god Arès and Harpinna, in possession of the principality of Pisa, immediately bordering on the district of Olympia. Cœnomaus, having been apprised by an oracle that death would overtake him if he permitted his daughter Hippodameia to marry, refused to give her in marriage except to some suitor who should beat him in a chariot-race from Olympia to the isthmus of Corinth:⁴ the ground here selected for the legendary victory of Pelops deserves attention, inasmuch as it is a line drawn from the assumed centre of Peloponnésus to its extremity, and thus comprises the whole territory with which Pelops is connected as eponym. Any suitor overmatched in the race was doomed to forfeit his life; and the fleetness of the Pisan horses, combined with the skill of the charioteer Myrtilus, had already caused thirteen unsuccessful competitors to perish by the lance of Cœnomaus.⁵ Pelops entered the lists as a suitor: his prayers moved the god Poseidôn to supply him

¹ Sapphō (Fragm. 82, Schneidewin)—

Δατὼ καὶ Νιόβᾳ μάλα μὲν φίλαι θσαν ἔταιραι.

Sapphō assigned to Niobē eighteen children (Aul. Gell. N. A. iv. Δ. xx. 7); Hesiod gave twenty; Homer twelve (Apollod. iii. 5).

The Lydian historian Xanthus gave a totally different version both of the genealogy and of the misfortunes of Niobē (Parthen. Narr. 33).

² Ovid, Metam. vi. 164–311. Pausan. i. 21, 5; viii. 2, 3.

³ Apollon. Rhod. ii. 358, and Schol.; Ister. Fragment. 59, Dindorf; Diodor. iv. 74.

⁴ Diodor. iv. 74.

⁵ Pausanias (vi. 21, 7) had read their names in the Hesiodic Eoiai.

with a golden chariot and winged horses; or according to another story, he captivated the affections of Hippodameia herself, who persuaded the charioteer Myrtillus to loosen the wheels of Cenomaus before he started, so that the latter was overturned and perished in the race. Having thus won the hand of Hippodameia, Pelops became prince of Pisa.¹ He put to death the charioteer Myrtillus, either from indignation at his treachery to Cenomaus,² or from jealousy on the score of Hippodameia; but Myrtillus was the son of Hermès, and though Pelops erected a temple in the vain attempt to propitiate that god, he left a curse upon his race which future calamities were destined painfully to work out.³

Pelops had a numerous issue by Hippodameia: Pittheus, Trœzen and Epidaurus, the eponyms of the two Argolic cities so called, are said to have been among them: Atreus and Thyestès were also his sons, and his daughter Nikippê married Sthenelus of Mykēnæ and became the mother of Eurystheus.⁴ We hear nothing of the principality of Pisa afterwards: the Pisatid villages become absorbed into the larger aggregate of Elis, after a vain struggle to maintain their separate right of presidency over the Olympic festival. But the legend ran that Pelops left his name to the whole peninsula: according to Thucydidès, he was enabled to do this because of the great wealth which he had brought with him from Lydia into a poor territory. The historian leaves out all the romantic interest of the genuine legends—preserving only this one circumstance, which, without being better attested than the rest, carries with it, from its common-place and prosaic character, a pretended historical plausibility.⁵

Besides his numerous issue by Hippodameia, Pelops had an illegitimate son named Chrysippus, of singular grace and beauty,

¹ Pindar, Olym. i. 140. The chariot-race of Pelops and Cenomaus was represented on the chest of Kypselus at Olympia: the horses of the former were given as having wings (Pausan. v. 17, 4). Pherekydès gave the same story (ap. Schol. ad Soph. Elect. 504).

² It is noticed by Herodotus and others as a remarkable fact, that no mules were ever bred in the Eleian territory: an Eleian who wished to breed a mule sent his mare for the time out of the region. The Eleians themselves ascribed this phenomenon to a disability brought on the land by a curse from the lips of Cenomaus (Herod. iv. 30; Plutarch, Quæst. Græc. p. 303).

³ Paus. v. 1, 1; Sophok. Elektr. 508; Eurip. Orest. 985, with Schol.; Plato, Kratyl. p. 395.

⁴ Apollod. ii. 4, 5. Pausan. ii. 30, 8; 26, 3; v. 8, 1. Hesiod. ap. Schol. ad Iliad. xx. 116.

⁵ Thucyd. i. 5.

towards whom he displayed so much affection as to excite the jealousy of Hippodameia and her sons. Atreus and Thystês conspired together to put Chrysippus to death, for which they were banished by Pelops and retired to Mykênae,¹—an event which brings us into the track of the Homeric legend. For Thucydidês, having found in the death of Chrysippus a suitable ground for the secession of Atreus from Pelops, conducts him at once to Mykênae, and shows a train of plausible circumstances to account for his having mounted the throne. Eurystheus, king of Mykênae, was the maternal nephew of Atreus: when he engaged in any foreign expedition, he naturally entrusted the regency to his uncle; the people of Mykênae thus became accustomed to be governed by him, and he on his part made efforts to conciliate them, so that when Eurystheus was defeated and slain in Attica, the Mykênaean people, apprehensive of an invasion from the Hérakleids, chose Atreus as at once the most powerful and most acceptable person for his successor.² Such was the tale which Thucydidês derived “from those who had learnt ancient Peloponnêssian matters most clearly from their forefathers.” The introduction of so much sober and quasi-political history, unfortunately unauthenticated, contrasts strikingly with the highly poetical legends of Pelops and Atreus, which precede and follow it.

Atreus and Thystês are known in the Iliad only as successive possessors of the sceptre of Zeus, which Thystês at his death bequeathes to Agamemnôn. The family dissensions among this fated race commence, in the Odyssey, with Agamemnôn the son of Atreus, and Aëgisthus the son of Thystês. But subsequent poets dwelt upon an implacable quarrel between the two fathers. The cause of the bitterness was differently represented: some alleged that Thystês had intrigued with the Krêtan Aeropé, the wife of his brother; other narratives

¹ We find two distinct legends respecting Chrysippus: his abduction by Laius king of Thêbes, on which the lost drama of Euripidês called Chrysippus turned (see Welcker, Griech. Tragödien, ii. p. 536), and his death by the hands of his half-brothers. Hyginus (f. 85) blends the two together.

² Thucyd. i. 9. λέγουσι: δὲ οἱ τὰ Πελοποννησιῶν σαφέστατα μνήμη παρὰ τῶν πρότερον δεδεγμένοι. According to Hellanikus, Atreus the elder son returns to Pisa after the death of Pelops with a great army, and makes himself master of his father's principality (Hellanik. ap. Schol. ad Iliad. ii. 105). Hellanikus does not seem to have been so solicitous as Thucydidês to bring the story into conformity with Homer. The circumstantial genealogy given in Schol. ad Eurip. Orest. 5, makes Atreus and Thystês reside during their banishment at Makestus in Triphylia: it is given without any special authority, but may perhaps come from Hellanikus.

mentioned that Thystēs procured for himself surreptitiously the possession of a lamb with a golden fleece, which had been designedly introduced among the flocks of Atreus by the anger of Hermēs, as a cause of enmity and ruin to the whole family.¹ Atreus, after a violent burst of indignation, pretended to be reconciled, and invited Thystēs to a banquet, in which he served up to him the limbs of his own son. The father ignorantly partook of the fatal meal. Even the all-seeing Hēlios is said to have turned back his chariot to the east in order that he might escape the shocking spectacle of this Thystēan banquet: yet the tale of Thystēan revenge—the murder of Atreus perpetrated by Ægisthus, the incestuous offspring of Thystēs by his daughter Pelopia—is no less replete with horrors.²

Homeric legend is never thus revolting. Agamemnōn and Menelaus are known to us chiefly with their Homeric attributes, which have not been so darkly overlaid by subsequent poets as those of Atreus and Thystēs. Agamemnōn and Menelaus are affectionate brothers; they marry two sisters the daughters of Tyndareus king of Sparta, Klytæmnēstra and Helen; for Helen, the real offspring of Zeus, passes as the daughter of Tyndareus.³ The “king of men” reigns at Mykēnæ; Menelaus succeeds Tyndareus at Sparta. Of the rape of Helen, and the siege of Troy consequent upon it, I shall speak elsewhere: I now touch only upon the family legends of the Atreids. Menelaus, on his return from Troy with the recovered Helen, is driven by storms far away to the distant regions of Phœnicia and Egypt, and is exposed to a thousand dangers and hardships before he again sets foot in Peloponnēsus. But at length he reaches Sparta, resumes his kingdom, and passes the rest of his days in uninterrupted happiness and splendour: being moreover husband of the godlike Helen and son-in-law of Zeus, he is even spared the pangs of death. When the fulness of his days is past, he is transported to the Elysian fields, there to dwell along with “the golden-haired Rhadamanthus” in a delicious climate and in undisturbed repose.⁴

Far different is the fate of the king of men, Agamemnōn. During his absence, the unwarlike Ægisthus, son of Thystēs, had seduced his wife Klytæmnēstra, in spite of the special

¹ Æschyl. Agamem. 1204, 1253, 1608; Hygin. 86; Attii Fragm. 19.

² Hygin. fab. 87-88.

³ So we must say in conformity to the ideas of antiquity: compare Homer, Iliad, xvi. 176; and Herodot. vi. 53.

⁴ Hom. Odyss. 280-300; iv. 83-560.

warning of the gods, who, watchful over this privileged family, had sent their messenger Hermès expressly to deter him from the attempt.¹ A venerable bard had been left by Agamemnôn as the companion and monitor of his wife, and so long as that guardian was at hand, Ægisthus pressed his suit in vain. But he got rid of the bard by sending him to perish in a desert island, and then won without difficulty the undefended Klytæmnêstra. Ignorant of what had passed, Agamemnôn returned from Troy victorious and full of hope to his native country; but he had scarcely landed when Ægisthus invited him to a banquet, and there, with the aid of the treacherous Klytæmnêstra, in the very hall of festivity and congratulation, slaughtered him and his companions "like oxen tied to the manger." His concubine Kassandra, the prophetic daughter of Priam, perished along with him by the hand of Klytæmnêstra herself.² The boy Orestês, the only male offspring of Agamemnôn, was stolen away by his nurse, and placed in safety at the residence of the Phôkian Strophius.

For seven years Ægisthus and Klytæmnêstra reigned in tranquillity at Mykênae on the throne of the murdered Agamemnôn. But in the eighth year the retribution announced by the gods overtook them: Orestês, grown to manhood, returned and avenged his father, by killing Ægisthus, according to Homer: subsequent poets add, his mother also. He recovered the kingdom of Mykênae, and succeeded Menelaus in that of Sparta. Hermione, the only daughter of Menelaus and Helen, was sent into the realm of the Myrmidons in Thessaly, as the bride of Neoptolemus, son of Achilles, according to the promise made by her father during the siege of Troy.³

Here ends the Homeric legend of the Pelopids, the final act of Orestês being cited as one of unexampled glory.⁴ Later poets made many additions: they dwelt upon his remorse and hardly-earned pardon for the murder of his mother, and upon his devoted friendship for Pylades; they wove many interesting tales, too, respecting his sisters Iphigeneia and Elektra and his cousin Hermione,—names which have become naturalised in every climate and incorporated with every form of poetry.

These poets did not at all scruple to depart from Homer,

¹ Odyss. i. 38; iii. 310—ἀνάλκιδος Αἴγισθοιο.

² Odyss. iii. 260-275; iv. 512-537; xi. 408. Deinias, in his Argolica, and other historians of that territory, fixed the precise day of the murder of Agamemnôn,—the thirteenth of the month Gamêliôn (Schol. ad Sophokl. Elektr. 275).

³ Odyss. iii. 306; iv. 9.

⁴ Odyss. i. 299.

and to give other genealogies of their own, with respect to the chief persons of the Pelopid family. In the Iliad and Odyssey, Agamemnôn is son of Atreus: in the Hesiodic Eoiai and in Stêsichorus, he is son of Pleisthenes the son of Atreus.¹ In Homer he is specially marked as reigning at Mykénæ; but Stêsichorus, Simonidês, and Pindar² represented him as having both resided and perished at Sparta or at Amyklæ. According to the ancient Cyprian Verses, Helen was represented as the daughter of Zeus and Nemesis: in one of the Hesiodic poems she was introduced as an Oceanic nymph, daughter of Oceanus and Têthys.³ The genealogical discrepancies, even as to the persons of the principal heroes and heroines, are far too numerous to be cited, nor is it necessary to advert to them, except as they bear upon the unavailing attempt to convert such legendary parentage into a basis of historical record or chronological calculation.

The Homeric poems probably represent that form of the legend, respecting Agamemnôn and Orestês, which was current and popular among the Æolic colonists. Orestês was the great heroic chief of the Æolic emigration; he, or his sons, or his descendants, are supposed to have conducted the Achæans to seek a new home, when they were no longer able to make head against the invading Dôrians: the great families at Tenedos and other Æolic cities, even during the historical æra, gloried in tracing back their pedigrees to this illustrious source.⁴ The legends connected with the heroic worship of these mythical ancestors form the basis of the character and attributes of Agamemnôn and his family, as depicted in Homer, in which Mykénæ appears as the first place in Peloponnesus, and Sparta

¹ Hesiod, Frigm. 60, p. 44, ed. Dünzter; Stêsichor. Frigm. 44, Kleine. The Scholiast ad Soph. Elektr. 539, in reference to another discrepancy between Homer and the Hesiodic poems about the children of Helen, remarks that we ought not to divert our attention from that which is moral and salutary to ourselves in the poets (*τὰ θεικὰ καὶ χρήσιμα ἡμῖν τοῖς ἐντυγχάνοντι*), in order to cavil at their genealogical contradictions.

Welcker in vain endeavours to show that Pleisthenês was originally introduced as the father of Atreus, not as his son (Griech. Tragöd. p. 678).

² Schol. ad Eurip. Orest. 46. “Ομηρος ἐν Μυκήναις φησι τὰ βασιλεῖα τοῦ Ἀγαμέμνονος. Σπησίχόρος δὲ καὶ Σιμωνίδης, ἐν Δακέδαιμονίᾳ. Pindar, Pyth. xi. 31; Nem. viii. 21. Stêsichorus had composed an 'Orestea, copied in many points from a still more ancient lyric Oresteia by Xanthus: compare Athen. xii. p. 513, and Aelian, V. H. iv. 26.

³ Hesiod. ap. Schol. ad Pindar. Nem. x. 150.

⁴ See the ode of Pindar addressed to Aristagoras of Tenedos (Nem. xi. 35; Strabo, xiii. p. 582). There were Penthilids at Mitylénê, from Penthilus, son of Orestês (Aristot. Polit. v. 8, 13, Schneid.).

only as the second : the former the special residence of “the king of men ;” the latter that of his younger and inferior brother, yet still the seat of a member of the princely Pelopids, and moreover the birth-place of the divine Helen. Sparta, Argos, and Mykénæ are all three designated in the Iliad by the goddess Hérê as her favourite cities ;¹ yet the connexion of Mykénæ with Argos, though the two towns were only ten miles distant, is far less intimate than the connexion of Mykénæ with Sparta. When we reflect upon the very peculiar manner in which Homer identifies Hérê with the Grecian host and its leader,—for she watches over the Greeks with the active solicitude of a mother, and her antipathy against the Trojans is implacable to a degree which Zeus cannot comprehend,²—and when we combine this with the ancient and venerated Héræon, or temple of Hérê, near Mykénæ, we may partly explain to ourselves the pre-eminence conferred upon Mykénæ in the Iliad and Odyssey. The Héræon was situated between Argos and Mykénæ ; in later times its priestesses were named and its affairs administered by the Argeians : but as it was much nearer to Mykénæ than to Argos, we may with probability conclude that it originally belonged to the former, and that the increasing power of the latter enabled them to usurp to themselves a religious privilege which was always an object of envy and contention among the Grecian communities. The Æolic colonists doubtless took out with them in their emigration the divine and heroic legends, as well as the worship and ceremonial rites, of the Héræon ; and in those legends the most exalted rank would be assigned to the close-adjoining and administering city.

Mykénæ maintained its independence even down to the Persian invasion. Eighty of its heavy-armed citizens, in the ranks of Leonidas at Thermopylæ, and a number not inferior at Plataæa, upheld the splendid heroic celebrity of their city during a season of peril, when the more powerful Argos disgraced itself by a treacherous neutrality. Very shortly

¹ Iliad, iv. 52. Compare Euripid. Hérakleid. 350.

² Iliad, iv. 31. Zeus says to Hérê—

Δαιμονίη, τί νύ σε Πριάμος, Πριάμοιο τε παῖδες
Τόσσα κακὰ ρέζεσκον ὅτι ἀστερχεῖς μενεαίνεις
Ἴλοιν ἔβαλατάξαν ἔνκτιμενον πτολεθρον ;
Εἰ δὲ σύ γ', εἰσαλθούσα πύλας καὶ τείχεα μακρὰ,
Οὐδὲν βεβρώθοις Πριάμον Πριάμοιο τε παῖδας,
Ἄλλους τε Τρωας, τότε κεν χόλον ἔξακέσταιο.

Again, xviii. 358—

ἢ βά νν σεῖο
Ἐξ αὐτῆς ἐγένοντο καρηκομώντες Ἀχαιοί.

afterwards Mykēnæ was enslaved and its inhabitants expelled by the Argeians. Though this city so long maintained a separate existence, its importance had latterly sunk to nothing, while that of the Dōrian Argos was augmented very much, and that of the Dōrian Sparta still more.

The name of Mykēnæ is imperishably enthroned in the Iliad and Odyssey; but all the subsequent fluctuations of the legend tend to exalt the glory of other cities at its expense. The recognition of the Olympic games as the grand religious festival of Peloponnesus gave vogue to that genealogy which connected Pelops with Pisa or Elis and withdrew him from Mykēnæ. Moreover, in the poems of the great Athenian tragedians, Mykēnæ is constantly confounded and treated as one with Argos. If any one of the citizens of the former, expelled at the time of its final subjugation by the Argeians, had witnessed at Athens a drama of Aeschylus, Sophoklēs, or Euripidēs, or the recital of an ode of Pindar, he would have heard with grief and indignation the city of his oppressors made a partner in the heroic glories of his own.¹ But the great political ascendancy acquired by Sparta contributed still farther to degrade Mykēnæ, by disposing subsequent poets to treat the chief of the Grecian armament against Troy as having been a Spartan. It has been already mentioned that Stēsichorus, Simonidēs and Pindar adopted this version of the legend. We know that Zeus Agamemnōn, as well as the hero Menelaus, was worshipped at the Dōrian Sparta;² and the feeling of intimate identity, as well as of patriotic pride, which had grown up in the minds of the Spartans connected with the name of Agamemnōn, is forcibly evinced by the reply of the Spartan Syagrus to Gelōn of Syracuse at the time of the Persian invasion of Greece. Gelōn was solicited to lend his aid in the imminent danger of Greece before the battle of Salamis: he offered to furnish an immense auxiliary force, on condition that the supreme command should be allotted to him. "Loudly indeed would the Pelopid Agamemnōn cry out (exclaimed Syagrus in rejecting this application), if he were to learn that the Spartans had been deprived of the headship by Gelōn and the Syracusans."³ Nearly a century

¹ See the preface of Dissen to the tenth Nem. of Pindar.

² Clemens Alexandr. Admonit. ad Gent. p. 24. 'Αγαμέμνονα γοῦν τινα Δία ἐν Σπάρτη τιμᾶσθαι Στάφυλος ιστορεῖ. See also Cenomaus ap. Euseb. Præparat. Evangel. v. 28.

³ Herodot. vii. 159. Ἡ κε μέγ' οιμώχειν δ Πελοπίδης 'Αγαμέμνων, πνθόμενος Σπαρτήτας ἀπαραιῆσθαι τὴν ἡγεμονίαν ὑπὸ Γέλωνός τε καὶ τῶν Συρακουσίων: compare Homer, Iliad, vii. 125. See what appears to be

before this event, in obedience to the injunctions of the Delphian oracle, the Spartans had brought back from Tegea to Sparta the bones of “the Lacônian Orestês,” as Pindar denominates him:¹ the recovery of these bones was announced to them as the means of reversing a course of ill-fortune, and of procuring victory in their war against Tegea.² The value which they set upon this acquisition, and the decisive results ascribed to it, exhibit a precise analogy with the recovery of the bones of Thêseus from Skyros by the Athenian Kimôn shortly after the Persian invasion.³ The remains sought were those of a hero properly belonging to their own soil, but who had died in a foreign land, and of whose protection and assistance they were for that reason deprived. And the super-human magnitude of the bones, which were contained in a coffin seven cubits long, is well-suited to the legendary grandeur of the son of Agamemnôn.

CHAPTER VIII

LACONIAN AND MESSENIAN GENEALOGIES

THE earliest names in Lacônian genealogy are, an indigenous Lelex and a Naiad nymph Kleochareia. From this pair sprung a son Eurôtas, and from him a daughter Sparta, who became the wife of Lacedæmôn, son of Zeus and Taygetê, daughter of Atlas. Amyklas, son of Lacedæmôn, had two sons, Kynortas and Hyakinthus—the latter a beautiful youth, the favourite of Apollo, by whose hand he was accidentally killed while playing at quoits: the festival of the Hyakinthia, which the Lacedæmônians generally, and the Amyklæans with special solemnity, celebrated throughout the historical ages, was traced back to this legend. Kynortas was succeeded by his son Periérês, who married Gorgophonê, daughter of Perseus, and had a numerous issue—Tyndareus, Ikarius, Aphareus, Leukippus, and Hippokoon. Some authors gave the genealogy differently, making Periérês, son of Æolus, to be the father of Kynortas, and Æbalus son of Kynortas, from whom sprung Tyndareus, Ikarius and Hippokoon.⁴

an imitation of the same passage in Josephus, *De Bello Judaico*, iii. 8, 4.

¹ Η μέγαλά γ' ἀν στενάξειαν οἱ πάτριοι νόμοι, &c.

² Pindar, *Pyth.* xi. 16.

³ Herodot. i. 68.

⁴ Plutarch, *Thêseus*, c. 36, Cimôn, c. 8; Pausan. iii. 3, 6.

⁴ Compare Apollod. iii. 10, 4. Pausan. iii. 1, 4.

Both Tyndareus and Ikarius, expelled by their brother Hippokoon, were forced to seek shelter at the residence of Thestius, king of Kalydôn, whose daughter, Lêda, Tyndareus espoused. It is numbered among the exploits of the omnipresent Hêraklês, that he slew Hippokoon and his sons, and restored Tyndareus to his kingdom, thus creating for the subsequent Hêrakleidan kings a mythical title to the throne. Tyndareus, as well as his brothers, are persons of interest in legendary narrative: he is the father of Kastôr—of Timandra, married to Echemus, the hero of Tegea¹—and of Klytæmnêstra, married to Agamemnôn. Pollux and the ever-memorable Helen are the offspring of Lêda by Zeus. Ikarius is the father of Penelopê, wife of Odysseus: the contrast between her behaviour and that of Klytæmnêstra and Helen became the more striking in consequence of their being so nearly related. Aphareus is the father of Idas and Lynkeus, while Leukippus has for his daughters, Phœbê and Ilaëira. According to one of the Hesiodic poems, Kastôr and Pollux were both sons of Zeus by Lêda, while Helen was neither daughter of Zeus nor of Tyndareus, but of Oceanus and Têthys.²

The brothers Kastôr and (Polydeukês, or) Pollux are no less celebrated for their fraternal affection than for their great bodily accomplishments: Kastôr, the great charioteer and horse-master; Pollux, the first of pugilists. They are enrolled both among the hunters of the Kalydônian boar and among the heroes of the Argonautic expedition, in which Pollux represses the insolence of Amykus, king of the Bebrykes, on the coast of Asiatic Thrace—the latter, a gigantic pugilist, from whom no rival has ever escaped, challenges Pollux, but is vanquished and killed in the fight.³

The two brothers also undertook an expedition into Attica for the purpose of recovering their sister Helen, who had been carried off by Thêseus in her early youth, and deposited by him at Aphidna, while he accompanied Peirithous to the under-world, in order to assist his friend in carrying off Persephonê. The force of Kastôr and Pollux was irresistible,

¹ Hesiod. ap. Schol. Pindar, Olymp. xi. 79.

² Hesiod. ap. Schol. Pindar, Nem. x. 150. Frigm. Hesiod. Dünzter. 58, p. 44. Tyndareus was worshipped as a god at Lacedæmôn (Varro ap. Serv. ad Virgil. Æneid. viii. 275).

³ Apollôn. Rhod. ii. 1-96. Apollod. i, 9, 20. Theokrit. xxii. 26-133. In the account of Apollônus and Apollodôrus, Amykus is slain in the contest: in that of Theokritus he is only conquered and forced to give in, with a promise to renounce for the future his brutal conduct: there were several different narratives. See Schol. Apollôn. Rhod. ii. 106.

and when they re-demanded their sister, the people of Attica were anxious to restore her: but no one knew where Thêseus had deposited his prize. The invaders, not believing in the sincerity of this denial, proceeded to ravage the country, which would have been utterly ruined, had not Dekelus, the eponymus of Dekeleia, been able to indicate Aphidna as the place of concealment. The indigenous Titakus betrayed Aphidna to Kastôr and Pollux, and Helen was recovered: the brothers, in evacuating Attica, carried away into captivity Æthra, the mother of Thêseus. In after-days, when Kastôr and Pollux, under the title of the Dioskuri, had come to be worshipped as powerful gods, and when the Athenians were greatly ashamed of this act of Thêseus—the revelation made by Dekelus was considered as entitling him to the lasting gratitude of his country, as well as to the favourable remembrance of the Lacedæmônians, who maintained the Dekeleians in the constant enjoyment of certain honorary privileges at Sparta,¹ and even spared that dème in all their invasions of Attica. It is not improbable that the existence of this legend had some weight in determining the Lacedæmônians to select Dekeleia as the place of their occupation during the Peloponni  ian war.

The fatal combat between Kastôr and Polydeukê on the one side, and Idas and Lynkeus on the other, for the possession of the daughters of Leukippus, was celebrated by more than one ancient poet, and forms the subject of one of the yet remaining Idylls of Theokritus. Leukippus had formally betrothed his daughters to Idas and Lynkeus; but the Tyndarids, becoming enamoured of them, outbid their rivals in the value of the customary nuptial gifts, persuaded the father to violate his promise, and carried off Phœbê and Ila  ira as their brides. Idas and Lynkeus pursued them and remonstrated against the injustice: according to Theokritus, this was the cause of the combat. But there was another tale, which seems the older, and which assigns a different cause to the quarrel. The four

¹ Diodôr. iv. 63. Herod. ix. 73. Δεκελέων δὲ τῶν τότε ἐργασμένων ἔργου χρήσμον ἐσ τὸν πάντα χρόνον, ὡς αὐτοὶ Ἀθηναῖοι λέγοντι. According to other authors, it was Akadêmus who made the revelation, and the spot called Akadêmia, near Athens, which the Lacedæmônians spared in consideration of this service (Plutarch, Thêseus, 31, 32, 33, where he gives several different versions of this tale by Attic writers, framed with the view of exonerating Thêseus). The recovery of Helen and the captivity of Æthra were represented on the ancient chest of Kypselus, with the following curious inscription—

Τυνδαρίδα Ἐλέναν φέρετον, Διθραν δ' Ἀθέναθεν ἔλκετον. (Pausan. v. 29, 2.)

had jointly made a predatory incursion into Arcadia, and had driven off some cattle, but did not agree about the partition of the booty—Idas carried off into Messénia a portion of it which the Tyndarids claimed as their own. To revenge and reimburse themselves, the Tyndarids invaded Messénia, placing themselves in ambush in the hollow of an ancient oak. But Lynkeus, endued with preternatural powers of vision, mounted to the top of Taygetus, from whence, as he could see over the whole Peloponnésus, he detected them in their chosen place of concealment. Such was the narrative of the ancient Cyprian Verses. Kastör perished by the hand of Idas, Lynkeus by that of Pollux. Idas, seizing a stone pillar from the tomb of his father Aphareus, hurled it at Pollux, knocked him down and stunned him; but Zeus, interposing at the critical moment for the protection of his son, killed Idas with a thunderbolt. Zeus would have conferred upon Pollux the gift of immortality, but the latter could not endure existence without his brother: he entreated permission to share the gift with Kastör, and both were accordingly permitted to live, but only on every other day.¹

The Dioskuri, or sons of Zeus,—as the two Spartan heroes, Kastör and Pollux, were denominated,—were recognised in the historical days of Greece as gods, and received divine honours. This is even noticed in a passage of the *Odyssey*, which is at any rate a very old interpolation, as well as in one of the Homeric hymns. What is yet more remarkable is, that they were invoked during storms at sea, as the special and all-powerful protectors of the endangered mariner, although their attributes and their celebrity seem to be of a character so dissimilar. They were worshipped throughout most parts of Greece, but with pre-eminent sanctity at Sparta.

Kastör and Pollux being removed, the Spartan genealogy passes from Tyndareus to Menelaus, and from him to Orestés.

Originally it appears that Messénê was a name for the western portion of Lacónia, bordering on what is called Pylos: it is so represented in the *Odyssey*, and Ephorus seems to have included it amongst the possessions of Orestés and his descendants.² Throughout the whole duration of the

¹ Cypria Carm. 8. p. 13, Dünzter. Lykophrôn, 538-566 with Schol. Apollod. iii. 11, 1. Pindar, Nem. x. 55-90. ἐπερήμερον ἀθανασίαν: also Homer, Odyss. xi. 302, with the Commentary of Nitzsch, vol. iii. p. 245.

The combat thus ends more favourably to the Tyndarids; but probably the account least favourable to them is the oldest, since their dignity went on continually increasing, until at last they became great deities.

² Odyss. xxi. 15. Diodôr. xv. 66.

Messénico-Dôrian kingdom, there never was any town called Messénê: the town was first founded by Epameinondas, after the battle of Leuctra. The heroic genealogy of Messénia starts from the same name as that of Lacônia—from the indigenous Lelex: his younger son Polykaôn, marries Messénê, daughter of the Argeian Triopas, and settles the country. Pausanias tells us that the posterity of this pair occupied the country for five generations; but he in vain searched the ancient genealogical poems to find the names of their descendants.¹ To them succeeded Periérês, son of Æolus; and Aphareus and Leukippus, according to Pausanias, were sons of Periérês.

Aphareus, after the death of his sons, founded the town of Arénê, and made over most part of his dominions to his kinsman Nêleus, with whom we pass into the Pylian genealogy.

CHAPTER IX

ARCADIAN GENEALOGY

THE Arcadian divine or heroic pedigree begins with Pelasgus, whom both Hesiod and Asius considered as an indigenous man, though Akusilaus the Argeian represented him as brother of Argos, the son of Zeus by Niobê, daughter of Phorôneus. Akusilaus wished to establish a community of origin between the Argeians and the Arcadians.

Lykaôn, son of Pelasgus and king of Arcadia, had, by different wives, fifty sons, the most savage, impious and wicked of mankind: Mænalus was the eldest of them. Zeus, in order that he might himself become a witness of their misdeeds, presented himself to them in disguise. They killed a child and served it up to him for a meal; but the god overturned the table and struck dead with thunder Lykaôn and all his fifty sons, with the single exception of Nyktimus, the youngest, whom he spared at the earnest intercession of the goddess Gæa (the Earth). The town near which the table was overturned received the name of Trapezus (Tabletown).

This singular legend (framed on the same etymological type as that of the ants in Ægina, recounted elsewhere) seems ancient, and may probably belong to the Hesiodic Catalogue. But Pausanias tells us a story in many respects different,

¹ Pausan. iv. 2, 1.

which was represented to him in Arcadia as the primitive local account, and which becomes the more interesting, as he tells us that he himself fully believes it. Both tales indeed go to illustrate the same point—the ferocity of Lykaôn's character, as well as the cruel rites which he practised. Lykaôn was the first who established the worship and solemn games of Zeus Lykæus: he offered up a child to Zeus, and made libations with the blood upon the altar. Immediately after having perpetrated this act, he was changed into a wolf.¹

“Of the truth of this narrative (observes Pausanias) I feel persuaded: it has been repeated by the Arcadians from old times, and it carries probability along with it. For the men of that day, from their justice and piety, were guests and companions at table with the gods, who manifested towards them approbation when they were good, and anger if they behaved ill in a palpable manner: indeed at that time there were some, who having once been men, became gods, and who yet retain their privileges as such—Aristæus, the Krêtan Britomartis, Héraklés son of Alkménê, Amphiaraus the son of Oiklés, and Pollux and Kastôr besides. We may therefore believe that Lykaôn became a wild beast, and that Niobê, the daughter of Tantalus, became a stone. But in my time, wickedness having enormously increased, so as to overrun the whole earth and all the cities in it, there are no farther examples of men exalted into gods, except by mere title and from adulation towards the powerful: moreover the anger of the gods falls tardily upon the wicked, and is reserved for them after their departure from hence.”

¹ Apollodôr. iii. 8, 1. Hygin. fab. 176. Eratosthen. Catasterism. 8. Pausan. viii. 2, 2-3. A different story respecting the immolation of the child is in Nikolaus Damask. Frigm. p. 41, Orelli. Lykaôn is mentioned as the first founder of the temple of Zeus Lykæus in Schol. Eurip. Orest. 1662; but nothing is there said about the human sacrifice or its consequences. In the historical times, the festival and solemnities of the Lykæa do not seem to have been distinguished materially from the other agônes of Greece (Pindar, Olymp. xiii. 104; Nem. x. 46): Xenias the Arcadian, one of the generals in the army of Cyrus the younger, celebrated the solemnity with great magnificence in the march through Asia Minor (Xen. Anab. i. 2, 10). But the fable of the human sacrifice, and the subsequent transmutation of the person who had eaten human food, into a wolf, continued to be told in connexion with them (Plato, de Republic. viii. c. 15, p. 417). Compare Pliny, H. N. viii. 34. This passage of Plato seems to afford distinct indication that the practice of offering human victims at the altar of the Lykæan Zeus was neither prevalent nor recent, but at most only traditional and antiquated; and it therefore limits the sense or invalidates the authority of the Pseudo-Platonic dialogue, Minos, c. 5.

Pausanias then proceeds to censure those who, by multiplying false miracles in more recent times, tended to rob the old and genuine miracles of their legitimate credit and esteem. The passage illustrates forcibly the views which a religious and instructed pagan took of his past time—how inseparably he blended together in it gods and men, and how little he either recognised or expected to find in it the naked phænomena and historical laws of connexion which belonged to the world before him. He treats the past as the province of legend, the present as that of history ; and in doing this he is more sceptical than the persons with whom he conversed, who believed not only in the ancient, but even in the recent and falsely reported miracles. It is true that Pausanias does not always proceed consistently with this position : he often rationalises the stories of the past, as if he expected to find historical threads of connexion ; and sometimes, though more rarely, accepts the miracles of the present. But in the present instance he draws a broad line of distinction between present and past, or rather between what is recent and what is ancient. His criticism is, in the main, analogous to that of Arrian in regard to the Amazons—denying their existence during times of recorded history, but admitting it during the early and unrecorded ages.

In the narrative of Pausanias, the sons of Lykaôn, instead of perishing by thunder from Zeus, become the founders of the various towns in Arcadia. And as that region was sub-divided into a great number of small and independent townships, each having its own eponym, so the Arcadian heroic genealogy appears broken up and subdivided. Pallas, Orestheus, Phigalus, Trapezeus, Mænalus, Mantinœus, and Tegeatês, are all numbered among the sons of Lykaôn, and are all eponyms of various Arcadian towns.¹

The legend respecting Kallistô and Arkas, the eponym of Arcadia generally, seems to have been originally quite independent of and distinct from that of Lykaôn. Eumêlus, indeed, and some other poets made Kallistô daughter of Lykaôn : but neither Hesiod nor Asius, nor Pherekydês, acknowledged any relationship between them.² The beautiful Kallistô, companion of Artemis in the chase, had bound herself by a vow of chastity : Zeus, either by persuasion or by force, obtained a violation of the vow, to the grievous displeasure both of Hérê and Artemis. The former changed Kallistô into a bear ; the latter, when she was in that shape,

¹ Paus. viii. 3. Hygin. fab. 177.

² Apollod. iii. 8, 2.

killed her with an arrow. Zeus gave to the unfortunate Kallistô a place among the stars, as the constellation of the Bear: he also preserved the child Arkas, of which she was pregnant by him, and gave it to the Atlantid nymph Maia to bring up.¹

Arkas, when he became king, obtained from Triptolemus and communicated to his people the first rudiments of agriculture; he also taught them to make bread, to spin, and to weave. He had three sons—Azan, Apheidas, and Elatus: the first was the eponym of Azania, the northern region of Arcadia; the second was one of the heroes of Tegea; the third was father of Ischys (rival of Apollo for the affections of Koronis), as well as of Ægyptus and Kyllén: the name of Ægyptus among the heroes of Arcadia is as old as the Catalogue in the Iliad.²

Aleus, son of Apheidas and king of Tegea, was the founder of the celebrated temple and worship of Athénê Alea in that town. Lykurgus and Kêpheus were his sons, Augê his daughter, who was seduced by Héraklês, and secretly bore to him a child: the father, discovering what had happened, sent Augê to Nauplius to be sold into slavery: Teuthras, king of Mysia in Asia Minor, purchased her and made her his wife: her tomb was shown at Pergamus on the river Kaikus even in the time of Pausanias.³

From Lykurgus,⁴ the son of Aleus and brother of Augê, we

¹ Pausan. viii. 3, 2. Apollod. iii. 8, 2. Hesiod. apud Eratosthen. Catasterism. I. Fragm. 182, Marktsch. Hygin. f. 177.

² Homer, Iliad, ii. 604. Pind. Olymp. vi. 44–63.

The tomb of Ægyptus, mentioned in the Iliad, was shown to Pausanias between Pheneus and Stymphalus (Pausan. viii. 16, 2). Ægyptus was a cognomen of Hermês (Pausan. viii. 47, 3).

The hero Arkas was worshipped at Mantinea, under the special injunction of the Delphian oracle (Pausan. viii. 9, 2).

³ Pausan. viii. 4, 6. Apollod. iii. 9, 1. Diodôr. iv. 33.

A separate legend respecting Augê and the birth of Têlephus was current at Tegea, attached to the temple, statue, and cognomen of Eileithyia in the Tegeatic agora (Pausan. viii. 48, 5).

Hekataeus seems to have narrated in detail the adventures of Augê (Pausan. viii. 4, 4; 47, 3. Hekataë. Fragm. 345, Didot).

Euripidês followed a different story about Augê and the birth of Têlephus in his lost tragedy called Augê. (See Strabo, xiii. p. 615.) Respecting the *Mυστοί* of Æschylus, and the two lost dramas, 'Αλεαδαί and *Mυστοί* of Sophoklês, little can be made out. (See Welcker, Griechisch. Tragöd., p. 53, 408–414.)

⁴ There were other local genealogies of Tegea deduced from Lykurgus: Bôtachus, eponym of the déme Bôtachidæ at that place, was his grandson (Nicolaus ap. Steph. Byz. v. Βωταχίδαι).

pass to his son Ankæus, numbered among the Argonauts, finally killed in the chase of the Kalydônian boar, and father of Agapenôr, who leads the Arcadian contingent against Troy, —(the adventures of his niece, the Tegeatic huntress Atalanta, have already been touched upon,)—then to Echemus, son of Aëropus and grandson of the brother of Lykurgus, Képheus. Echemus is the chief heroic ornament of Tegea. When Hyllus, the son of Héraklês, conducted the Hérakleids on their first expedition against Peloponnêsus, Echemus commanded the Tegean troops who assembled along with the other Peloponnésians at the isthmus of Corinth, to repel the invasion: it was agreed that the dispute should be determined by single combat, and Echemus, as the champion of Peloponnêsus, encountered and killed Hyllus. Pursuant to the stipulation by which they had bound themselves, the Hérakleids retired, and abstained for three generations from pressing their claim upon Peloponnêsus. This valorous exploit of their great martial hero was cited and appealed to by the Tegeates before the battle of Plataea, as the principal evidence of their claim to the second post in the combined army, next in point of honour to that of the Lacedæmônians, and superior to that of the Athenians: the latter replied to them by producing as counter-evidence the splendid heroic deeds of Athens,—the protection of the Hérakleids against Eurystheus, the victory over the Kadmeians of Thêbes, and the complete defeat of the Amazons in Attica.¹ Nor can there be any doubt that these legendary glories were both recited by the speakers, and heard by the listeners, with profound and undoubting faith, as well as with heart-stirring admiration.

One other person there is—Ischys, son of Elatus and grandson of Arkas—in the fabulous genealogy of Arcadia, whom it would be improper to pass over, inasmuch as his name and adventures are connected with the genesis of the memorable god or hero Æsculapius, or Asklepious. Korônis, daughter of Phlegyas, and resident near the lake Bœbëis in Thessaly, was beloved by Apollo and became pregnant by him: unfaithful to the god, she listened to the propositions of Ischys son of Elatus, and consented to wed him: a raven brought to Apollo the fatal news, which so incensed him that he changed the

¹ Herodot. ix. 27. Echemus is described by Pindar (Ol. xi. 69) as gaining the prize of wrestling in the fabulous Olympic games, on their first establishment by Héraklês. He also found a place in the Hesiodic Catalogue as husband of Timandra, the sister of Helen and Klytæmnêstra (Hesiod, Fragm. 105, p. 318, Marktscheff.).

colour of the bird from white, as it previously had been, into black.¹ Artemis, to avenge the wounded dignity of her brother, put Korônis to death; but Apollo preserved the male child of which she was about to be delivered, and consigned it to the Centaur Cheirôn to be brought up. The child was named Asklépius or Æsculapius, and acquired, partly from the teaching of the beneficent leech Cheirôn, partly from inborn and superhuman aptitude, a knowledge of the virtues of herbs and a mastery of medicine and surgery, such as had never before been witnessed. He not only cured the sick, the wounded, and the dying, but even restored the dead to life. Kapaneus, Eriphylê, Hippolytus, Tyndareus and Glaukus were all affirmed by different poets and logographers to have been endued by him with a new life.² But Zeus now found himself under the necessity of taking precautions lest mankind, thus unexpectedly protected against sickness and death, should no longer stand in need of the immortal gods: he smote Asklépius with thunder and killed him. Apollo was so exasperated by this slaughter of his highly-gifted son, that he killed the Cyclôpes who had fabricated the thunder, and Zeus was about to condemn him to Tartarus for doing so; but on the intercession of Latôna he

¹ Apollodôr. iii. 10, 3; Hesiod, Fragm. 141-142. Marktscheff.; Strab. ix. p. 442; Pherekydês, Fragm. 8; Akusilaus, Fragm. 25, Didot.

Τῷ μὲν ἄρ' ἄγγελος ἡλθε κόραξ, ιερῆς ἀπὸ δαιτὸς
Πινθὼ ἐς πηγαδεῖν, καὶ ρ' ἔφρασεν ἐργ' αἰδηλα
φοιβῷ ἀκερσεκοῦμη, ὅτι Ἰσχυς γῆμε Κόρωνιν
Εἰλατίδης, Φλεγύνα διογνήτως θυγατρα.
(Hesiod, Fr.)

The change of the colour of the crow is noticed both in Ovid, Metamorph. ii. 632, in Antonin. Liberal. c. 20, and in Servius ad Virgil. Æneid. vii. 761, though the name “*Corvo custode ejus*” is there printed with a capital letter, as if it were a man named *Corvus*.

² Schol. Eurip. Alkêst. 1; Diodôr. iv. 71; Apollodôr. iii. 10, 3; Pindar, Pyth. iii. 59; Sextus Empiric. adv. Grammatic. i. 12, p. 271. Stesichorus named Eriphylê—the Naupaktian verses, Hippolytus—(compare Servius ad Virgil. Æneid. vii. 761) Panyasis, Tyndareus; a proof of the popularity of this tale among the poets. Pindar says that Æsculapius was “tempted by gold” to raise a man from the dead, and Plato (Legg. iii. p. 408) copies him: this seems intended to afford some colour for the subsequent punishment. “Mercede id captum (observes Boeckh. ad Pindar. l. c.) Æsculapium fecisse recentior est fictio; Pindari fortasse ipsius, quem tragicis secuti sunt: haud dubie a medicorum avaris moribus profecta, qui Græcorum medicis nostrisque communes sunt.” The rapacity of the physicians (granting it to be ever so well-founded, both then and now) appears to me less likely to have operated upon the mind of Pindar, than the disposition to extenuate the cruelty of Zeus, by imputing guilty and sordid views to Asklépius. Compare the citation from Dikæarchus, *infra*, p. 157.

relented, and was satisfied with imposing upon him a temporary servitude in the house of Admétus at Pheræ.

Asklépius was worshipped with very great solemnity at Trikka, at Kôs, at Knidus, and in many different parts of Greece, but especially at Epidaurus, so that more than one legend had grown up respecting the details of his birth and adventures: in particular, his mother was by some called Arsinoë. But a formal application had been made on this subject (so the Epidaurians told Pausanias) to the oracle of Delphi, and the god in reply acknowledged that Asklépius was his son by Korônis.¹ The tale above recounted seems to have been both the oldest and the most current. It is adorned by Pindar in a noble ode, wherein however he omits all mention of the raven as messenger—not specifying who or what the spy was from whom Apollo learnt the infidelity of Korônis. By many this was considered as an improvement in respect of poetical effect, but it illustrates the mode in which the characteristic details and simplicity of the old fables² came to be exchanged for dignified generalities, adapted to the altered taste of society.

Machaôn and Podaleirius, the two sons of Asklépius, command the contingent from Trikka, in the north-west region of Thessaly, at the siege of Troy by Agamemnôn.³ They are the leeches of the Grecian army, highly prized and consulted by all the wounded chiefs. Their medical renown was further prolonged in the subsequent poem of Arktinus, the Iliu-Persis, wherein the one was represented as unrivalled in surgical operations, the other as sagacious in detecting and appreciating

¹ Pausan. ii. 26, where several distinct stories are mentioned, each springing up at some one or other of the sanctuaries of the god: quite enough to justify the idea of three *Æsculapii* (Cicero, N. D. iii. 22).

Homer, Hymn. ad *Æsculap.* 2. The tale briefly alluded to in the Homeric Hymn. ad Apollin. 209, is evidently different: Ischys is there the companion of Apollo, and Korônis is an Arcadian damsel.

Aristidês, the fervent worshipper of Asklépius, adopted the story of Korônis, and composed hymns on the γάμον Κορωνίδος καὶ γένεσιν τοῦ θεοῦ (Orat. 23, p. 463, Dind.).

² See Pindar, Pyth. iii. The Scholiast puts a construction upon Pindar's words which is at any rate far-fetched, if indeed it be at all admissible: he supposes that Apollo knew the fact from his own omniscience, without any informant, and he praises Pindar for having thus transformed the old fable. But the words οὐδὲ λαθε σκοπῶν seem certainly to imply some informant: to suppose that σκοπῶν means the god's own mind, is a strained interpretation.

³ Iliad. ii. 730. The Messénians laid claim to the sons of Asklépius as their heroes, and tried to justify the pretension by a forced construction of Homer (Pausan. iii. 4, 2).

morbid symptoms. It was Podaleirius who first noticed the glaring eyes and disturbed deportment which preceded the suicide of Ajax.¹

Galen appears uncertain whether Asklepius (as well as Dionysus) was originally a god, or whether he was first a man and then became afterwards a god;² but Apollodorus professed to fix the exact date of his apotheosis.³ Throughout all the historical ages the descendants of Asklepius were numerous and widely diffused. The many families or gentes called Asklepiads, who devoted themselves to the study and practice of medicine, and who principally dwelt near the temples of Asklepius, whither sick and suffering men came to obtain relief—all recognised the god, not merely as the object of their common worship, but also as their actual progenitor. Like Solon, who reckoned Nêleus and Poseidon as his ancestors, or the Milesian Hekataeus, who traced his origin through fifteen successive links to a god—like the privileged gens at Pêlion in Thessaly,⁴ who considered the wise Centaur Cheirôn as their progenitor, and who inherited from him their precious secrets respecting the medicinal herbs of which their neighbourhood was full—Asklepiads, even of the later times, numbered and specified all the intermediate links which separated them from their primitive divine parent. One of these genealogies has been preserved to us, and we may be sure that there were

¹ Arktinus, Epicc. Græc. Fragm. 2, p. 22, Dünzter. The Ilias Minor mentioned the death of Machaon by Eurypylus, son of Telephus (Fragm. 5, p. 19, Dünzter).

² 'Ασκληπιός γέ τοι καὶ Διόνυσος, εἴτ' ἄνθρωποι πρότερον ἤστην εἴτε καὶ ἀρχῆθεν θεοί (Galen, Protreptic. 9. t. l. p. 22, Kuhn). Pausanias considers him as θεὸς ἐξ ἀρχῆς (ii. 26, 7). In the important temple at Smyrna he was worshipped as Ζεὺς Ἀσκληπιός (Aristidēs, Or. 6. p. 64; Or. 23. p. 456, Dind.).

³ Apollodorus. ap. Clem. Alex. Strom. i. p. 381; see Heyne, Fragment. Apollodorus. p. 410. According to Apollodorus, the apotheosis of Héraklēs and of Asklepius took place at the same time, thirty-eight years after Héraklēs began to reign at Argos.

⁴ About Hekataeus, Herodot. ii. 143; about Solon, Diogen. Laërt. Vit. Platon. init.

A curious fragment, preserved from the lost works of Dikæarchus, tells us of the descendants of the Centaur Cheirôn at the town of Pêlion, or perhaps at the neighbouring town of Démétrias,—it is not quite certain which, perhaps at both (see Dikæarchus. Fragment. ed. Fuhr, p. 408). Ταύτην δὲ τὴν δύναμιν ἐν τῶν πολιτῶν οἴδε γένος, δὴ λέγεται Χείρωνος ἀπόγονον εἶναι παραδίδωσι δὲ καὶ δείκνυσι πατὴρ νῦν, καὶ οὕτως ἡ δύναμις φυλάσσεται, ὡς οὐδεὶς ἄλλος οἴδε τῶν πολιτῶν οὐχ ὅσιον δὲ τοὺς ἐπισταμένους τὰ φάρμακα μισθοῦν τοῖς καμνοῦσι βοηθεῖν, ἀλλὰ προῦκα.

Plato, de Republ. iii. 4 (p. 391). Ἀχιλλεὺς ὑπὸ τῷ σοφωτάτῳ Χείρωνι τεθραμμένος. Compare Xenophon, De Venat. c. 1.

many such, as the Asklepiads were found in many different places.¹ Among them were enrolled highly instructed and accomplished men, such as the great Hippocrates and the historian Ktēsias, who prided themselves on the divine origin of themselves and their gens²—so much did the legendary element pervade even the most philosophical and positive minds of historical Greece. Nor can there be any doubt that their means of medical observation must have been largely extended by their vicinity to a temple so much frequented by the sick, who came in confident hopes of divine relief, and who, whilst they offered up sacrifice and prayer to Æsculapius, and slept in his temple in order to be favoured with healing suggestions in their dreams, might, in case the god withheld his supernatural aid, consult his living descendants.³ The sick visitors at Kôs,

¹ See the genealogy at length in Le Clerc, *Histoire de la Médecine*, lib. ii. c. 2. p. 78, also p. 287; also Littré, *Introduction aux Œuvres Complètes d'Hippocrate*, t. i. p. 34. Hippokratis was the seventeenth from Æsculapius.

Theopompos the historian went at considerable length into the pedigree of the Asklepiads of Kôs and Knidus, tracing them up to Podaleirius and his first settlement at Syrus in Karia (see Theopomp. *Fragm.* 111, *Didot*): Polyanthus of Kyrêne composed a special treatise *περὶ τῆς τῶν Ἀσκληπιαδῶν γενέσεως* (Sextus Empiric. *adv. Grammat.* i. 12. p. 271); see Stephan. *Byz.* v. Kôs, and especially Aristidēs, *Orat.* vii. *Asklépiadæ*. The Asklepiads were even reckoned among the *Ἀρχηγέται* of Rhodes, jointly with the Hérakleids (Aristidēs, *Or.* 44, *ad Rhod.* p. 839, *Dind.*).

In the extensive sacred enclosure at Epidaurus stood the statues of Asklepius and his wife Epionê (Pausan. ii. 29, 1); two daughters are coupled with him by Aristophanê, and he was considered especially *εὐπταυ* (Plutus, 654); Jaso, Panakeia and Hygieia are named by Aristidēs.

² Plato, *Protagor.* c. 6. (p. 311). *Ἴπποκράτη τὸν Κῶον, τὸν τῶν Ἀσκληπιαδῶν*; also Phædr. c. 121 (p. 270). About Ktēsias, Galen, *Opp.* t. v. p. 652, Basil.; and Bahrt, *Fragm.* Ktēsiae, p. 20. Aristotle (see Stahr. *Aristotelia*, i. p. 32) and Xenophôn, the physician of the emperor Claudius, were both Asklepiads (Tacit. *Annal.* xii. 61). Plato, *de Republ.* iii. 405, calls them *τοὺς κομψοὺς Ἀσκληπιαδάς*.

Pausanias, a distinguished physician at Gela in Sicily, and contemporary of the philosopher Empedoklés, was also an Asklepiad: see the verses of Empedoklés upon him, Diogen. *Laërt.* viii. 61.

³ Strabo, viii. p. 374; Aristophan. *Vesp.* 122; Plutus, 635-750; where the visit to the temple of Æsculapius is described in great detail, though with a broad farcical colouring.

During the last illness of Alexander the Great, several of his principal officers slept in the temple of Serapis, in the hope that remedies would be suggested to them in their dreams (Arrian, vii. 26).

Pausanias, in describing the various temples of Asklepius which he saw, announces as a fact quite notorious and well understood, “Here cures are wrought by the god” (ii. 36, 1; iii. 26, 7; vii. 27, 4): see Suidas, v. *Ἀρισταρχος*. The orations of Aristidēs, especially the 6th and 7th, *Asklēpius and the Asklepiadæ*, are the most striking manifestations of faith and

or Trikka, or Epidaurus, were numerous and constant, and the tablets usually hung up to record the particulars of their maladies, the remedies resorted to, and the cures operated by the god, formed both an interesting decoration of the sacred ground and an instructive memorial to the Asklépiads.¹

The genealogical descent of Hippocratēs and the other Asklépiads from the god Asklépius is not only analogous to that of Hekataeus and Solōn from their respective ancestral gods, but also to that of the Lacedæmōnian kings from Héraklēs, upon the basis of which the whole supposed chronology of the ante-historical times has been built, from Eratosthenēs and Apollodōrus down to the chronologers of the present century.² I shall revert to this hereafter.

CHAPTER X

ÆAKUS AND HIS DESCENDANTS—ÆGINA, SALAMIS, AND PHTHIA

THE memorable heroic genealogy of the Æakids establishes a fabulous connexion between Ægina, Salamis, and Phthia, which we can only recognise as a fact, without being able to trace its origin.

Æakus was the son of Zeus, born of Ægina, daughter of Asōpus, whom the god had carried off and brought into the island to which he gave her name : she was afterwards married to Aktōr, and had by him Menoetius, father of Patroclus. As there were two rivers named Asōpus, one between Phlius and Sikyōn, and another between Thēbes and Platæa—so the Æginētan heroic genealogy was connected both with that of Thēbes and with that of Phlius ; and this belief led to practical consequences in the minds of those who accepted the legends as genuine history. For when the Thēbans, in the

thanksgiving towards Asculapius, as well as attestations of his extensive working throughout the Grecian world ; also Orat. 23 and 25, 'Ιερῶν Λόγος. 1, 3 ; and Or. 45 (De Rheticā, p. 22, Dind.), *αἱ τ' ἐν Ἀσκληπιοῦ τῶν δεῖ διατριβόντων ἀγέλαι, &c.*

¹ Pausan. ii, 27, 3 ; 36, 1. Ταύταις ἔγγεγραμμένα ἔστι καὶ ἀνδρῶν καὶ γυναικῶν ὀνόματα ἀκεσθέντων ὑπὸ τοῦ Ἀσκληπιοῦ, προσέτι δὲ καὶ νόσημα, διὰ ἔκαστος ἐνδόσησε, καὶ διπλῶς λάθη,—the cures are wrought by the god himself.

² "Apollodōrus ætatem Herculis pro cardine chronologæ habuit" (Heyne, ad Apollodōr. Fragm. p. 410).

68th Olympiad, were hard-pressed in war by Athens, they were directed by the Delphian oracle to ask assistance of their next of kin. Recollecting that Thêbê and *Ægina* had been sisters, common daughters of Asôpus, they were induced to apply to the *Æginêtans* as their next of kin, and the *Æginêtans* gave them aid, first by sending to them their common heroes, the *Æakids*, next by actual armed force.¹ Pindar dwells emphatically on the heroic brotherhood between Thêbes, his native city, and *Ægina*.²

Æakus was alone in *Ægina*: to relieve him from this solitude, Zeus changed all the ants in the island into men, and thus provided him with a numerous population, who, from their origin, were called Myrmidons.³ By his wife Endéis, daughter of Cheirôn, *Æakus* had for his sons Péleus and Telamôn: by the Nereid Psamathê, he had Phôkus. A monstrous crime had then recently been committed by Pelops, in killing the Arcadian prince, Stymphalus, under a simulation of friendship and hospitality: for this the gods had smitten all Greece with famine and barrenness. The oracles affirmed that nothing could relieve Greece from this intolerable misery except the prayers of *Æakus*, the most pious of mankind. Accordingly envoys from all quarters flocked to *Ægina*, to prevail upon *Æakus* to put up prayers for them: on his supplications the gods relented, and the suffering immediately ceased. The grateful Greeks established in *Ægina* the temple and worship of Zeus Panhellénîus, one of the lasting monuments and institutions of the island, on the spot where *Æakus* had offered up his prayer. The statues of the envoys who had come to solicit him were yet to be seen in the *Æakeion*, or sacred edifice of *Æakus*, in the time of Pausanias: and the Athenian Isokratê, in his eulogy of Evagoras, the despot of Salamis in Cyprus (who traced his descent through Teukros to *Æakus*), enlarges upon this signal miracle, recounted and believed by other Greeks as well as by the *Æginêtans*, as a proof both of the

¹ Herodot. v. 81.

² Nem. iv. 22. Isth. vii. 16.

³ This tale, respecting the transformation of the ants into men, is as old as the Hesiodic Catalogue of Women. See Dûntzer, Fragm. Epicc. 21, p. 34; evidently an etymological tale from the name Myrmidones. Pausanias throws aside both the etymology and the details of the miracle: he says that Zeus raised men from the earth, at the prayer of *Æakus* (ii. 29, 2): other authors retained the etymology of Myrmidons from *μύρμηκες*, but gave a different explanation (Kallimachus, Fragm. 114, Dûntzer). *Μυρμιδόνων* ἐσσῆνα (Strabo, viii. p. 375). *Ἐσσῆν, δοικιστής* (Hygin. fab. 52).

According to the Thessalian legend, Myrmidôn was the son of Zeus by Eurymedusa, daughter of Kletor; Zeus having assumed the disguise of an ant (Clemens. Alex. Admon. ad Gent. p. 25, Sylb.).

great qualities and of the divine favour and patronage displayed in the career of the Æakids.¹ Æakus was also employed to aid Poseidôn and Apollo in building the walls of Troy.²

Pêleus and Telamôn, the sons of Æakus, contracting a jealousy of their bastard brother, Phôkus, in consequence of his eminent skill in gymnastic contests, conspired to put him to death. Telamôn flung his quoit at him while they were playing together, and Pêleus despatched him by a blow with his hatchet in the back. They then concealed the dead body in a wood, but Æakus, having discovered both the act and the agents, banished the brothers from the island.³ For both of them eminent destinies were in store.

While we notice the indifference to the moral quality of actions implied in the old Hesiodic legend, when it imputes distinctly and nakedly this proceeding to two of the most admired persons of the heroic world—it is not less instructive to witness the change of feeling which had taken place in the age of Pindar. That warm eulogist of the great Æakid race hangs down his head with shame, and declines to recount, though he is obliged darkly to glance at, the cause which forced the pious Æakus to banish his sons from Ægina. It appears that Kallimachus, if we may judge by a short fragment, manifested the same repugnance to mention it.⁴

Telamôn retired to Salamis, then ruled by Kychreus, the son of Poseidôn and Salamis, who had recently rescued the island from the plague of a terrible serpent. This animal, expelled

¹ Apollod. iii. 12, 6. Isokrat. Evagr. Encom. vol. ii. p. 278, Auger. Pausan. i. 44, 13; ii. 29, 6. Schol. Aristoph. Equit. 1253.

So in the 106th Psalm, respecting the Israelites and Phinees, v. 29, “They provoked the Lord to anger by their inventions, and the plague was great among them;” “Then stood up Phinees and prayed, and so the plague ceased;” “And that was counted unto him for righteousness, among all posterities for evermore.”

² Pindar, Olymp. viii. 41, with the Scholia. Didymus did not find this story in any other poet older than Pindar.

³ Apollod. iii. 12, 6, who relates the tale somewhat differently; but the old epic poem Alkmæonis gave the details (ap. Schol. Eurip. Andromach. 685)—

Ἐνθα μὲν ἀντίθεος Τελαμῶν τροχοειδῆ δίσκω
Πλῆγε κάρον· Πηλεὺς δὲ θώας αὖτε χείρα τανύσσας
Ἄξινην ἔχαλκον ἐπεπλήγει μετὰ νώτα.

⁴ Pindar, Nem. v. 15, with Scholia, and Kallimach. Frag. 136. Apollodorus Rhodius represents the fratricide as inadvertent and unintentional (i. 92); one instance amongst many of the tendency to soften down and moralise the ancient tales.

Pindar, however, seems to forget this incident when he speaks in other places of the general character of Pêleus (Olymp. ii. 75-86. Isthm. vii. 40).

from Salamis, retired to Eleusis in Attica, where it was received and harboured by the goddess Dêmêtêr in her sacred domicile.¹ Kychreus dying childless left his dominion to Telamôn, who, marrying Peribcea, daughter of Alkathoos, and granddaughter of Pelops, had for his son the celebrated Ajax. Telamôn took part both in the chase of the Kalydônian boar and in the Argonautic expedition: he was also the intimate friend and companion of Héraklês, whom he accompanied in his enterprise against the Amazons, and in the attack made with only six ships upon Laomedôn, king of Troy. This last enterprise having proved completely successful, Telamôn was rewarded by Héraklês with the possession of the daughter of Laomedôn, Hésionê—who bore to him Teukros, the most distinguished archer amidst the host of Agamemnôn, and the founder of Salamis in Cyprus.²

Pêleus went to Phthia, where he married the daughter of Eurytiôn, son of Aktôr, and received from him the third part of his dominions. Taking part in the Kalydônian boar-hunt, he unintentionally killed his father-in-law Eurytiôn, and was obliged to flee to Iôlkos, where he received purification from Akastus, son of Pelias: the danger to which he became exposed, by the calumnious accusations of the enamoured wife of Akastus, has already been touched upon in a previous section. Pêleus also was among the Argonauts; the most memorable event in his life however was his marriage with the sea-goddess Thetis. Zeus and Poseidôn had both conceived a violent passion for Thetis. But the former having been forewarned by Prométheus that Thetis was destined to give birth to a son more powerful than his father, compelled her, much against her own will, to marry Pêleus; who, instructed by the intimations of the wise Cheirôn, was enabled to seize her on the coast called Sêpias in the southern region of Thessaly. She changed her form several times, but Pêleus held her fast until she resumed her original appearance, and she was then no longer able to resist. All the gods were present, and brought splendid gifts to these memorable

¹ Apollod. iii. 12, 7. Euphoriôn, Frigm. 5, Düntzer, p. 43, Epicc. Græc. There may have been a tutelary serpent in the temple at Eleusis, as there was in that of Athénê Polias at Athens (Herodot. viii. 41, Photius, v. Οἰκουρψ ὑφιν. Aristophan. Lysistr. 759, with the Schol.).

² Apollod. iii. 12, 7. Hesiod. ap. Strab. ix. p. 393.

The libation and prayer of Héraklês, prior to the birth of Ajax, and his fixing the name of the yet unborn child, from an eagle (*αιερός*) which appeared in response to his words, was detailed in the Hesiodic Eoiai, and is celebrated by Pindar (Isthm. v. 30-54). See also the Scholia.

nuptials: Apollo sang with his harp, Poseidôn gave to Pêleus the immortal horses Xanthus and Balius, and Cheirôn presented a formidable spear, cut from an ash-tree on Mount Pêlion. We shall have reason hereafter to recognise the value of both these gifts in the exploits of Achilles.¹

The prominent part assigned to Thetis in the Iliad is well known, and the post-Homeric poets of the Legend of Troy introduced her as actively concurring first to promote the glory, finally to bewail the death, of her distinguished son.² Pêleus having survived both his son Achilles and his grandson Neoptolemus, is ultimately directed to place himself on the very spot where he had originally seized Thetis, and thither the goddess comes herself to fetch him away, in order that he may exchange the desertion and decrepitude of age for a life of immortality along with the Nêreids.³ The spot was indicated to Xerxês when he marched into Greece by the Iônians who accompanied him, and his magi offered solemn sacrifices to her as well as to the other Nêreids, as the presiding goddesses and mistresses of the coast.⁴

Neoptolemus or Pyrrhus, the son of Achilles, too young to engage in the commencement of the siege of Troy, comes on the stage after the death of his father as the indispensable and prominent agent in the final capture of the city. He returns victor from Troy, not to Phthia, but to Epirus, bringing with him the captive Andromachê, widow of Hectôr, by whom Molossus is born to him. He himself perishes in the full vigour of life at Delphi by the machinations of Orestês, son of Agamemnôn. But his son Molossus—like Fleance, the son of Banquo, in Macbeth—becomes the father of the

¹ Apollodôr. iii. 13, 5. Homer, Iliad, xviii. 434; xxiv. 62. Pindar, Nem. iv. 50–68; Isthm. vii. 27–50. Herodot. vii. 192. Catullus, Carm. 64. Epithal. Pel. et Thetidos, with the prefatory remarks of Dœring.

The nuptials of Pêleus and Thetis were much celebrated in the Hesiodic Catalogue, or perhaps in the Eoiai (Düntzer, Epic. Græc. Frag. 36, p. 39), and Ægimius—see Schol. ad Apollôn. Rhod. iv. 869—where there is a curious attempt of Staphylus to rationalise the marriage of Pêleus and Thetis.

There was a town, seemingly near Pharsalus in Thessaly, called Thetidêum. Thetis is said to have been carried by Pêleus to both these places: probably it grew up round a temple and sanctuary of this goddess (Pherekyd. Frag. 16, Didot; Hellanik. ap. Steph. Byz. Θετιδεῖον).

² See the arguments of the lost poems, the Cypria and the Æthiopis, as given by Proclus, in Düntzer, Fragn. Epic. Gr. p. 11–16; also Schol. ad Iliad. xvi. 140; and the extract from the lost Ψυχοστασία of Æschylus, ap. Plato, de Republic. ii. c. 21 (p. 382, St.).

³ Eurip. Androm. 1242–1260; Pindar, Olymp. ii. 86.

⁴ Herodot. vii. 198.

powerful race of Molossian kings, who played so conspicuous a part during the declining vigour of the Grecian cities, and to whom the title and parentage of Æakids was a source of peculiar pride, identifying them by community of heroic origin with genuine and undisputed Hellénes.¹

The glories of Ajax, the second grandson of Æakus, before Troy, are surpassed only by those of Achilles. He perishes by his own hand, the victim of an insupportable feeling of humiliation, because a less worthy claimant is allowed to carry off from him the arms of the departed Achilles. His son Philæus receives the citizenship of Athens, and the gens or dème called Philaidæ traced up to him its name and its origin: moreover the distinguished Athenians, Miltiadés and Thucydidés, were regarded as members of this heroic progeny.²

Teukros escaped from the perils of the siege of Troy as well as from those of the voyage homeward, and reached Salamis in safety. But his father Telamôn, indignant at his having returned without Ajax, refused to receive him, and compelled him to expatriate. He conducted his followers to Cyprus, where he founded the city of Salamis: his descendant Evagoras was recognised as a Teukrid and as an Æakid even in the time of Isokratés.³

Such was the splendid heroic genealogy of the Æakids,—a family renowned for military excellence. The Æakeion at Ægina, in which prayer and sacrifice were offered to Æakus,

¹ Plutarch, Pyrrh. 1; Justin. xi. 3; Eurip. Androm. 1253; Arrian, Exp. Alexand. i. 11.

² Pherekydés and Hellanikus ap. Marcellin. Vit. Thucydid. init.; Pausan. ii. 29, 4; Plutarch, Solôn, 10. According to Apollodórus, however, Pherekydés said that Telamôn was only the friend of Péléus, not his brother,—not the son of Æakus (iii. 12, 7): this seems an inconsistency. There was however a warm dispute between the Athenians and the Megarians respecting the title to the hero Ajax, who was claimed by both (see Pausan. i. 42, 4; Plutarch, *I. c.*): the Megarians accused Peisistratus of having interpolated a line into the Catalogue in the Iliad (Strabo, ix. p. 394).

³ Herodot. vii. 90; Isokrat. Enc. Evag. *ut sup.*; Sophokl. Ajax, 984-995; Vellei. Patercul. i. 1; Æschyl. Pers. 891, and Schol. The return from Troy of Teukros, his banishment by Telamôn, and his settlement in Cyprus, formed the subject of the *Τεῦκρος* of Sophoklés, and of a tragedy under a similar title by Pacuvius (Cicero de Orat. i. 58; ii. 46); Sophokl. Ajax, 892; Pacuvii Fragm. Teucr. 15—

“Te repudio, nec recipio, natum abdico,
Fascesse.”

The legend of Teukrus was connected in Attic archæology with the peculiar functions and formalities of the judicature, *ἐν Φρεαττοῖ* (Pausan. i. 28, 12; ii. 29, 7).

remained in undiminished dignity down to the time of Pausanias.¹ This genealogy connects together various eminent gentes in Achaia Phthiotis, in Ægina, in Salamis, in Cyprus, and amongst the Epirotic Molossians. Whether we are entitled to infer from it that the island of Ægina was originally peopled by Myrmidones from Achaia Phthiotis, as O. Müller imagines,² I will not pretend to affirm. These mythical pedigrees seem to unite together special clans or gentes, rather than the bulk of any community—just as we know that the Athenians generally had no part in the Æakid genealogy, though certain particular Athenian families laid claim to it. The intimate friendship between Achilles and the Opuntian hero Patroklos—and the community of name and frequent conjunction between the Lokrian Ajax, son of Oïleus, and Ajax, son of Telamôn—connect the Æakids with Opus and the Opuntian Lokrians, in a manner which we have no farther means of explaining. Pindar too represents Menœtius, father of Patroklos, as son of Aktôr and Ægina, and therefore maternal brother of Æakus.³

CHAPTER XI

ATTIC LEGENDS AND GENEALOGIES

THE most ancient name in Attic archæology, as far as our means of information reach, is that of Erechtheus, who is mentioned both in the Catalogue of the Iliad and in a brief allusion of the Odyssey. Born of the Earth, he is brought up by the goddess Athénê, adopted by her as her ward, and installed in her temple at Athens, where the Athenians offer to him annual sacrifices. The Athenians are styled in the Iliad, “the people of Erechtheus.”⁴ This is the most ancient

¹ Hesiod. *Fragm. Düntz. Eoiai*, 55, p. 43—

‘Αλκην μὲν γὰρ ἔδωκεν Ὄλύμπιος Αἰακίδαισι,
Νοῦν δ’ Ἀμυθαονίδαις, πλούτον δ’ ἐπορ’ Ἀτρεΐδησι.

Polyb. v. 2—

Αἰακίδας, πολέμῳ κεχαρητότας ἡύτε δαιτι.

² See his *Æginetica*, p. 14, his earliest work.

³ Pindar, *Olymp.* ix. 74. The hero Ajax, son of Oïleus, was especially worshipped at Opus; solemn festivals and games were celebrated in his honour.

⁴ Iliad, ii. 546. *Odyss.* vii. 81—

Οἱ δὲ ἄρ' Ἀθήνας εἰχον. . . .
Δῆμον Ἐρεχθῆος μεγαλήτορος, ὃν ποτ' Ἀθήνη,
Θρέψε, Διὸς θυγάτηρ, τέκε δὲ ζείδωρος ἄρουρα

testimony concerning Erechtheus, exhibiting him as a divine or heroic, certainly a superhuman person, and identifying him with the primitive germination (if I may use a term, the Grecian equivalent of which would have pleased an Athenian ear) of Attic man. And he was recognised in this same character, even at the close of the fourth century before the Christian æra, by the Butadæ, one of the most ancient and important gentes at Athens, who boasted of him as their original ancestor: the genealogy of the great Athenian orator Lykurgus, a member of this family, drawn up by his son Abrôn, and painted on a public tablet in the Erechtheion, contained as its first and highest name, Erechtheus, son of Hêphæstos and the Earth. In the Erechtheion, Erechtheus was worshipped conjointly with Athénê: he was identified with the god Poseidôn, and bore the denomination of Poseidôn Erechtheus: one of the family of the Butadæ, chosen among themselves by lot, enjoyed the privilege and performed the functions of hereditary priest.¹ Herodotus also assigns the same earth-born origin to Erechtheus:² but Pindar, the old poem called the Danais, Euripidês, and Apollodôrus—all name Erichthonius, son of Hêphæstos and the Earth, as the being who was thus adopted and made the temple-companion of Athénê, while Apollodôrus in another place identifies Erichthonius with Poseidôn.³ The Homeric scholiast treated Erechtheus and Erichthonius as the same person under two names:⁴ and since, in regard to such mythical persons

Κἀδ δ' ἐν 'Αθήνῃσι εἰσεν ἐψὲ ἐνὶ πίονι τῷν,
Ἐνθάδε μιν ταῦροισι καὶ ἄρνεοισι ιλάονται
Κούροις Αθηναῖον, περιτελλομένων ἐναυτῶν.

¹ See the Life of Lykurgus, in Plutarch's (I call it by that name, as it is always printed with his works) Lives of the Ten Orators, t. iv. p. 382-384, Wytt. Κατῆγον δὲ τὸ γένος ἀπὸ τούτων καὶ Ἐρεχθέως τοῦ Γῆς καὶ Ἡφαίστου . . . καὶ ἐστὶν αὐτὴ ἡ καταγωγὴ τοῦ γένους τῶν ιερασμάτων τοῦ Ποσειδῶνος, &c. ²Ος τὴν ιερωσύνην Ποσειδῶνος Ἐρεχθέως εἰχε (pp. 382, 383). Erechtheus Πάρεδρος of Athénê—Aristides, Panathenaic. p. 184, with the Scholia of Frommel.

Butēs, the eponymus of the Butadæ, is the first priest of Poseidôn Erichthonius: Apollod. iii. 15, 1. So Kallias (Xenoph. Sympos. viii. 40), ἵερεὺς θεῶν τῶν ἀπ' Ἐρεχθέως.

² Herodot. viii. 55.

³ Harpokration, v. Αὐτόχθων. Ο δὲ Πίγδαρος καὶ δ τὴν Δαναΐδα πεποιηκώς φασιν, Ἐριχθόνιος ἐξ Ἡφαίστου καὶ Γῆς φανῆναι. Euripidês, Ion, 21. Apollod. iii. 14, 6; 15, 1. Compare Plato, Timæus, c. 6.

⁴ Schol. ad Iliad. ii. 546, where he cites also Kallimachus for the story of Erichthonius. Etymologicum Magn. Ἐρεχθεῖς. Plato (Kritias, c. 4) employs vague and general language to describe the agency of Hêphæstos and Athénê, which the old fable in Apollodôrus (iii. 14, 6) details in coarser terms. See Ovid, Metam. ii. 757.

there exists no other test of identity of the subject except perfect similarity of the attributes, this seems the reasonable conclusion.

We may presume, from the testimony of Homer, that the first and oldest conception of Athens and its sacred acropolis places it under the special protection, and represents it as the settlement and favourite abode of Athénê, jointly with Poseidôn; the latter being the inferior, though the chosen companion of the former, and therefore exchanging his divine appellation for the cognomen of Erechtheus. But the country called Attica, which, during the historical ages, forms one social and political aggregate with Athens, was originally distributed into many independent dêmes or cantons, and included, besides, various religious clans or hereditary sects (if the expression may be permitted); that is, a multitude of persons not necessarily living together in the same locality, but bound together by an hereditary communion of sacred rites, and claiming privileges as well as performing obligations, founded upon the traditional authority of divine persons for whom they had a common veneration. Even down to the beginning of the Peloponnêsian war, the demots of the various Attic dêmes, though long since embodied in the larger political union of Attica, and having no wish for separation, still retained the recollection of their original political autonomy. They lived in their own separate localities, resorted habitually to their own temples, and visited Athens only occasionally for private or political business, or for the great public festivals. Each of these aggregates, political as well as religious, had its own eponymous god or hero, with a genealogy more or less extended, and a train of mythical incidents more or less copious, attached to his name, according to the fancy of the local expositors and poets. The eponymous heroes Marathôn, Dekelus, Kolônus, or Phlyus, had each their own title to worship, and their own position as themes of legendary narrative, independent of Erechtheus, or Poseidôn, or Athénê, the patrons of the acropolis common to all of them.

But neither the archæology of Attica, nor that of its various component fractions, was much dwelt upon by the ancient epic poets of Greece. Thêseus is noticed both in the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* as having carried off from Krête Ariadnê, the daughter of Minos—thus commencing that connexion between the Krêtan and Athenian legends which we afterwards find so largely amplified—and the sons of Thêseus take part in the Trojan war.¹ The chief collectors and narrators of the Attic mythes

¹ Æthra, mother of Thêseus, is also mentioned (*Homer, Iliad, iii. 144*).

were, the prose logographers, authors of the many compositions called *Attides*, or works on Attic archaeology. These writers—*Hellenikus*, the contemporary of *Herodotus*, is the earliest composer of an *Attis* expressly named, though *Pherekydēs* also touched upon the Attic fables—these writers, I say, interwove into one chronological series the legends which either greatly occupied their own fancy, or commanded the most general reverence among their countrymen. In this way the religious and political legends of *Eleusis*, a town originally independent of *Athens*, but incorporated with it before the historical age, were worked into one continuous sequence along with those of the *Erechtheids*. In this way, too, *Kekrops*, the eponymous hero of the portion of Attica called *Kekropia*, came to be placed in the mythical chronology at a higher point even than the primitive god or hero *Erechtheus*.

Ogygēs is said to have reigned in Attica¹ 1020 years before the first Olympiad, or 1796 years B.C. In his time happened the deluge of *Deukaliōn*, which destroyed most of the inhabitants of the country. After a long interval, *Kekrops*, an indigenous person, half-man and half-serpent, is given to us by *Apollodōrus* as the first king of the country; he bestowed upon the land, which had before been called *Aktē*, the name of *Kekropia*. In his day there ensued a dispute between *Athēnē* and *Poseidōn* respecting the possession of the acropolis at *Athens*, which each of them coveted. First, *Poseidōn* struck the rock with his trident, and produced the well of salt water which existed in it, called the *Erechthēis*: next came *Athēnē*, who planted the sacred olive-tree ever afterwards seen and venerated in the portion of the *Erechtheion* called the cell of *Pandrosus*. The twelve gods decided the dispute; and *Kekrops* having testified before them that *Athēnē* had rendered this inestimable service, they adjudged the spot to her in preference to *Poseidōn*. Both the ancient olive-tree and the well produced by *Poseidōn* were seen on the acropolis, in the temple consecrated jointly to *Athēnē* and *Erechtheus*, throughout the historical ages. *Poseidōn*, as a mark of his wrath for the preference given to *Athēnē*, inundated the Thriasian plain with water.²

¹ *Hellenikus*, *Fragm.* 62; *Philochor.* *Fragm.* 8, ap. *Euseb.* *Præp. Evang.* x. 10, p. 489. *Larcher (Chronologie d'Hérodote*, ch. ix. s. 1, p. 278) treats both the historical personality and the date of *Ogygēs* as perfectly well authenticated.

² *Apollod.* iii. 14, 1; *Herodot.* viii. 55; *Ovid, Metam.* vi. 72. The impression of *Poseidōn*'s trident is still shown on the rocky floor of the *Erechtheum* at *Athens*. The story current among the *Athenians*

During the reign of Kekrops, Attica was laid waste by Karian pirates on the coast, and by invasions of the Aônian inhabitants from Bœôtia. Kekrops distributed the inhabitants of Attica into twelve local sections—Kekropia, Tetrapolis, Epakria, Dekeleia, Eleusis, Aphidna, Thorikus, Braurôn, Kythêrus, Sphêttus, Képhisis, Phalêrus. Wishing to ascertain the number of inhabitants, he commanded each man to cast a single stone into a general heap: the number of stones was counted, and it was found that there were twenty thousand.¹

Kekrops married the daughter of Aktæus, who (according to Pausanias's version) had been king of the country before him, and had called it by the name of Aktæa.² By her he had three daughters, Aglaurus, Ersê and Pandrosus, and a son, Erysichthôn.

Erysichthôn died without issue, and Kranaus succeeded him,—another indigenous person and another eponymus,—for the name Kranai was an old denomination of the inhabitants of Attica.³ Kranaus was dethroned by Amphiktyôn, by some called an indigenous man; by others, a son of Deukaliôn: Amphiktyôn in his turn was expelled by Erichthonius, son of Hêphaëstos and the Earth,—the same person apparently as Erechtheus, but inserted by Apollodôrus at this point of the series. Erichthonius, the pupil and favoured companion of Athênê, placed in the acropolis the original Palladium or wooden statue of that goddess, said to have dropped from heaven: he was moreover the first to celebrate the festival of the Panathenæa. He married the nymph Pasithea, and had for his son and successor Pandiôn.⁴ Erichthonius was the first person who taught the art of breaking in horses to the yoke, and who drove a chariot and four.⁵

In the time of Pandiôn, who succeeded to Erichthonius, Dionysus and Dêmêtêr both came into Attica; the latter was received by Keleos at Eleusis.⁶ Pandiôn married the nymph Zeuxippê, and had twin sons, Erechtheus and Butês, and two

represented Kekrops as the judge of this controversy (Xenoph. *Memor.* iii. 5, 10).

¹ Philochor. ap. Strabo. ix. p. 397.

² The Parian chronological marble designates Aktæus as an indigenous person. *Marmor Parium*, Epoch. 3. Pausan. i. 2, 5.

³ Herod. viii. 44. *Kpavaal 'Aθηναι*, Pindar.

⁴ Apollod. iii. 14, 6. Pausan. i. 26, 7.

⁵ Virgil, *Georgic.* iii. 114.

⁶ The mythe of the visit of Dêmêtêr to Eleusis, on which occasion she vouchsafed to teach her holy rites to the leading Eleusinians, is more fully touched upon in my first chapter.

daughters, Proknê and Philomêla. The two latter are the subjects of a memorable and well-known legend. Pandiôn having received aid in repelling the Thêbans from Têreus king of Thrace, gave him his daughter Proknê in marriage, by whom he had a son, Itys. The beautiful Philomêla, going to visit her sister, inspired the barbarous Thracian with an irresistible passion ; he violated her person, confined her in a distant pastoral hut, and pretended that she was dead, cutting out her tongue to prevent her from revealing the truth. After a long interval, Philomêla found means to inform her sister of the cruel deed which had been perpetrated ; she wove into a garment words describing her melancholy condition, and despatched it by a trusty messenger. Proknê, overwhelmed with sorrow and anger, took advantage of the free egress enjoyed by women during the Bacchanalian festival to go and release her sister : the two sisters then revenged themselves upon Têreus by killing the boy Itys, and serving him up for his father to eat : after the meal had been finished, the horrid truth was revealed to him. Têreus snatched a hatchet to put Proknê to death : she fled, along with Philomêla, and all the three were changed into birds—Proknê became a swallow, Philomêla a nightingale, and Têreus an hoopoe.¹ This tale, so popular with the poets, and so illustrative of the general character of Grecian legend, is not less remarkable in another point of view—that the great historian Thucydidês seems to allude to it as an historical fact,² not however directly mentioning the final metamorphosis.

¹ Apollod. iii. 14, 8 ; Æsch. Supplic. 61 ; Soph. Elektr. 107 ; Ovid, Metamorph. vi. 425-670. Hyginus gives the fable with some additional circumstances, fab. 45. Antoninus Liberalis (Nar. 11), or Bœus, from whom he copies, has composed a new narrative by combining together the names of Pandareos and Aêdon, as given in the *Odyssey*, xix. 523, and the adventures of the old Attic fable. The hoopoe still continued the habit of chasing the nightingale : it was to the Athenians a present fact. See Schol. Aristoph. Aves, 212.

² Thucyd. ii. 29. He makes express mention of the nightingale in connexion with the story, though not of the metamorphosis. See below, chap. xvi. So also does Pausanias mention and reason upon it as a real incident : he finds upon it several moral reflections (i. 5, 4 ; x. 4, 5) : the author of the *Λόγος Ἐπιτάφιος*, ascribed to Demosthenês, treats it in the same manner, as a fact ennobling the tribe Pandionis, of which Pandiôn was the eponymus. The same author, in touching upon Kekrops, the eponymus of the Kekropis tribe, cannot believe literally the story of his being half-man and half-serpent : he rationalises it, by saying that Kekrops was so called because in wisdom he was like a man, in strength like a serpent (Demosth. p. 1397, 1398, Reiske). Hesiod glances at the fable (Opp. Di. 566), δρθρογόνη Πανδιονίς ὅρτο χελιδών ; see also Ælian, V. H. xii. 20. The subject was handled by Sophoklês in his lost Têreus.

After the death of Pandiōn, Erechtheus succeeded to the kingdom, and his brother, Butēs, became priest of Poseidōn Erichthonius; a function which his descendants ever afterwards exercised, the Butadæ or Eteobutadæ. Erechtheus seems to appear in three characters in the fabulous history of Athens—as a god, Poseidōn Erechtheus¹—as a hero, Erechtheus, son of the Earth—and now, as a king, son of Pandiōn: so much did the ideas of divine and human rule become confounded and blended together in the imagination of the Greeks in reviewing their early times.

The daughters of Erechtheus were not less celebrated in Athenian legend than those of Pandiōn. Prokris, one of them, is among the heroines seen by Odysseus in Hadēs: she became the wife of Kephalus, son of Deionēs, and lived in the Attic dème of Thorikus.

Kreüsa, another daughter of Erechtheus, seduced by Apollo, becomes the mother of Iōn, whom she exposes immediately after his birth, in the cave north of the acropolis, concealing the fact from every one. Apollo prevails upon Hermēs to convey the new-born child to Delphi, where he is brought up as a servant of the temple, without knowing his parents. Kreüsa marries Xuthus, son of Æolus, but continuing childless, she goes with Xuthus to the Delphian oracle to inquire for a remedy. The god presents to them Iōn, and desires them to adopt him as their son: their son Achæus is afterwards born to them, and Iōn and Achæus become the eponyms of the Iōnians and Achæans.²

Oreithyia, the third daughter of Erechtheus, was stolen away by the god Boreas while amusing herself on the banks of the Ilissus, and carried to his residence in Thrace. The two sons of this marriage, Zêtēs and Kalais, were born with wings: they took part in the Argonautic expedition, and engaged in the pursuit of the harpies: they were slain at Ténos by Hēraklēs. Kleopatra, the daughter of Boreas and Oreithyia, was married to Phineus, and had two sons, Plexippus and Pandiōn; but Phineus afterwards espoused a second wife, Idæa,

¹ Poseidōn is sometimes spoken of under the name of Erechtheus simply (Lycophrōn, 158). See Hesychius, v. Ἐρέχθεύς.

² Upon this story of Iōn is founded the tragedy of Euripidēs which bears that name. I conceive many of the points of that tragedy to be of the invention of Euripidēs himself; but to represent Iōn as son of Apollo, not of Xuthus, seems a genuine Attic legend. Respecting this drama, see O. Müller, Hist. of Dorians, ii. 2, 13–15. I doubt however the distinction which he draws between the Iōnians and the other population of Attica.

the daughter of Dardanus, who, detesting the two sons of the former bed, accused them falsely of attempting her chastity, and persuaded Phineus in his wrath to put out the eyes of both. For this cruel proceeding he was punished by the Argonauts in the course of their voyage.¹

On more than one occasion the Athenians derived, or at least believed themselves to have derived, important benefits from this marriage of Boreas with the daughter of their primæval hero: one inestimable service, rendered at a juncture highly critical for Grecian independence, deserves to be specified.² At the time of the invasion of Greece by Xerxēs, the Grecian fleet was assembled at Chalkis and Artemision in Eubœa, awaiting the approach of the Persian force, so overwhelming in its numbers as well by sea as on land. The Persian fleet had reached the coast of Magnésia and the south-eastern corner of Thessaly without any material damage, when the Athenians were instructed by an oracle "to invoke the aid of their son-in-law." Understanding the advice to point to Boreas, they supplicated his aid and that of Oreithyia most earnestly, as well by prayer as by sacrifice,³ and the event corresponded to their wishes. A furious north-easterly wind immediately arose, and continued for three days to afflict the Persian fleet as it lay on an unprotected coast: the number of ships driven ashore, both vessels of war and of provision, was immense, and the injury done to the armament was never thoroughly repaired. Such was the powerful succour which the Athenians derived,

¹ Apollodōr. iii. 15, 2; Plato, Phædr. c. 3; Sophok. Antig. 984; also the copious Scholion on Apollōn. Rhod. i. 212.

The tale of Phineus is told very differently in the Argonautic expedition as given by Apollōnus Rhodius, ii. 180. From Sophoklēs we learn that this was the Attic version.

The two winged sons of Boreas and their chase of the Harpies were noticed in the Hesiodic Catalogue (see Schol. Apollōn. Rhod. ii. 296). But whether the Attic legend of Oreithyia was recognised in the Hesiodic poems seems not certain.

Both Aeschylus and Sophoklēs composed dramas on the subject of Oreithyia (Longin. de Sublimit. c. 3). "Orithyia Atheniensis, filia Terrigenæ, et a Borea in Thraciam rapta" (Servius ad Virg. Aeneid. xii. 83). Terrigena is the γηγενῆς Ἐρεχθεύς. Philochorus (Fragm. 30) rationalised the story, and said that it alluded to the effects of a violent wind.

² Herodot. vii. 189. Οἱ δὲ ἡνὶ Ἀθηναῖοι σφι λέγουσι βοηθήσαντα τὸν Βορῆν πρότερον, καὶ τότε ἐκεῖνα κατεργασασθαι· καὶ ίρδν ἀπελθόντες Βορέω ἰδρύσαντο παρὰ ποταμῷ Ἰλισσῷ.

³ Herodot. l. c. Ἀθηναῖοι τὸν Βορῆν ἐκ θεοποτίου ἐπεκαλέσαντο, ἐλθόντος σφι ἄλλου χρηστηρίου, τὸν γαμβρὸν ἐπίκουρον καλέσασθαι. Βορῆς δὲ, κατὰ τὸν Ἐλλήνων λόγον ἔχει γυναῖκα Ἀττικὴν, Ὁρειθύην τὴν Ἐρεχθῖος. Κατὰ δὴ τὸ κῆδος τοῦτο, οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι, συμβαλλεόμενοι σφι τὸν Βορῆν γαμβρὸν ελναί, &c.

at a time of their utmost need, from their son-in-law Boreas; and their gratitude was shown by consecrating to him a new temple on the banks of the Ilissus.

The three remaining daughters of Erechtheus—he had six in all¹—were in Athenian legend yet more venerated than their sisters, on account of having voluntarily devoted themselves to death for the safety of their country. Eumolpus of Eleusis was the son of Poseidôn and the eponymous hero of the sacred gens called the Eumolpids, in whom the principal functions, appertaining to the mysterious rites of Dêmêtêr at Eleusis, were vested by hereditary privilege. He made war upon Erechtheus and the Athenians, with the aid of a body of Thracian allies; indeed it appears that the legends of Athens, originally foreign and unfriendly to those of Eleusis, represented him as having been himself a Thracian born and an immigrant into Attica.² Respecting Eumolpus however and his parentage, the discrepancies much exceed even the measure of licence usual in the legendary genealogies, and some critics, both ancient and modern, have sought to reconcile these contradictions, by the usual stratagem of supposing two or three different persons of the same name. Even Pausanias, so familiar with this class of unsworn witnesses, complains of the want of native Eleusinian genealogists,³ and of the extreme licence of fiction in which other authors had indulged.

¹ Suidas and Photius, v. Παρθένοι: Protogeneia and Pandôra are given as the names of two of them. The sacrifice of Pandôra, in the Iambi of Hippônax (Hippônact. Fragm. xxi. Welck. ap. Athen. ix. p. 370), seems to allude to this daughter of Erechtheus.

² Apollodôr. iii. 15, 3; Thucyd. ii. 15; Isokratês (Panegyr. t. i. p. 206; Panathenaic. t. ii. p. 560, Auger), Lykurgus, cont. Leocrat. p. 201, Reiske; Pausan. i. 38, 3; Euripid. Erechth. Fragm. The Schol. ad Soph. CED. Col. 1048, gives valuable citations from Ister, Akestodorus and Androtiôn: we see that the inquirers of antiquity found it difficult to explain how the Eumolpids could have acquired their ascendent privileges in the management of the Eleusinia, seeing that Eumolpus himself was a foreigner,—Ζητεῖται, τι δῆποτε οἱ Εὐμολπίδαι τῶν τελετῶν ἔξαρχοντι, ξένοι ὄντες. Thucydidês does not call Eumolpus a Thracian: Strabo's language is very large and vague (vii. p. 321): Isokratês says that he assailed Athens in order to vindicate the rights of his father Poseidôn to the sovereign patronage of the city. Hyginus copies this (fab. 46).

³ Pausan. i. 38, 3. Ἐλευσίνιοι τε ἄρχαῖοι, ἀπε οὐ προσόντων σφισι γενεαλόγων, ἀλλα τε πλάστασι δεδώκασι καὶ μάλιστα ἐσ τὰ γένη τῶν ἥρωών. See Heyne ad Apollodôr. iii. 15, 4. “Eumolpi nomen modo communicatum pluribus, modo plurium hominum res et facta cumulata in unum. Is ad quem Hercules venisse dicitur, senior aetate fuit: antiquior est is de quo hoc loco agitur . . . antecessisse tamen hunc debet alias, qui cum Triptolemo vixit,” &c. See the learned and valuable comments of Lobeck in his Aglaophamus, t. i. p. 206-213: in regard to the

In the Homeric Hymn to Dêmêtér, the most ancient testimony before us,—composed, to all appearance, earlier than the complete incorporation of Eleusis with Athens,—Eumolpus appears (to repeat briefly what has been stated in a previous chapter) as one of the native chiefs or princes of Eleusis, along with Triptolemus, Dioklês, Polyxeinus and Dolichus; Keleos is the king, or principal among these chiefs, the son or lineal descendant of the eponymous Eleusis himself. To these chiefs, and to the three daughters of Keleos, the goddess Dêmêtér comes in her sorrow for the loss of her daughter Persephonê: being hospitably entertained by Keleos she reveals her true character, commands that a temple shall be built to her at Eleusis, and prescribes to them the rites according to which they are to worship her.¹ Such seems to have been the ancient story of the Eleusinians respecting their own religious antiquities: Keleos, with Metaneira his wife, and the other chiefs here mentioned, were worshipped at Eleusis, and from thence transferred to Athens as local gods or heroes.² Eleusis became incorporated with Athens, apparently not very long before the time of Solôn; and the Eleusinian worship of Dêmêtér was then received into the great religious solemnities of the Athenian state, to which it owes its remarkable subsequent extension and commanding influence. In the Atticised worship of the Eleusinian Dêmêtér, the Eumolpids and the Kérykes were the principal hereditary functionaries: Eumolpus, the eponym of this great family, came thus to play the principal part in the Athenian legendary version of the war between Athens and Eleusis. An oracle had pronounced that

discrepancies of this narrative he observes, I think, with great justice (p. 211), “*quo uno exemplo ex innumerabilibus delecto, arguitur eorum temeritas, qui ex variis discordibusque poetarum et mythographorum narratiunculis, antiquae famae formam et quasi lineamenta recognosci posse sperant.*”

¹ Homer, Hymn. ad Cerer. 153-475—

... Ἡ δὲ κιῦσα θεμιστοπόλοις βασιλεῦσι
Δεῖξε, Τριπτολέμῳ τε, Διοκλεῖ τε πληξτπψ,
Εὐμόλου τε βῆρ, Κελέῳ θ' ἡγήτορι λαών,
Δρησμοσύνην θ' ἵερων.

Also v. 105—

Τὴν δὲ ἴδον Κελεοῖο Ἐλευσινίδαο θύγατρες.

The hero Eleusis is mentioned in Pausanias, i. 38, 7; some said that he was the son of Hermês, others that he was the son of Ogygês. Compare Hygin. f. 147.

² Keleos and Metaneira were worshipped by the Athenians with divine honours (Athenagoras, Legat. p. 53, ed. Oxon.): perhaps he confounds divine and heroic honours, as the Christian controversialists against Paganism were disposed to do. Triptolemus had a temple at Eleusis (Pausan. i. 38, 6).

Athens could only be rescued from his attack by the death of the three daughters of Erechtheus; their generous patriotism consented to the sacrifice, and their father put them to death. He then went forth confidently to the battle, totally vanquished the enemy, and killed Eumolpus with his own hand.¹ Erechtheus was worshipped as a god, and his daughters as goddesses, at Athens.² Their names and their exalted devotion were cited along with those of the warriors of Marathōn, in the public assembly of Athens, by orators who sought to arouse the languid patriot, or to denounce the cowardly deserter; and the people listened both to one and the other with analogous feelings of grateful veneration, as well as with equally unsuspecting faith in the matter of fact.³

Though Erechtheus gained the victory over Eumolpus, yet the story represents Poseidōn as having put an end to the life

¹ *Apollodōr.* iii. 15, 4. Some said that Immaradus, son of Eumolpus, had been killed by Erechtheus (*Pausan.* i. 5, 2); others, that both Eumolpus and his son had experienced this fate (*Schol. ad Eurip. Phœniss.* 854). But we learn from Pausanias himself what the story in the interior of the Erechtheion was,—that Erechtheus killed Eumolpus (*i.* 27, 3).

² *Cicero, Nat. Deor.* iii. 19; *Philochor. ap. Schol. Oedip. Col.* 100. Three daughters of Erechtheus perished, and three daughters were worshipped (*Apollodōr.* iii. 15, 4; *Hesychius, Ζεῦγος τριπάρθενον*; *Eurip. Erechtheus, Frigm.* 3, *Dindorf*); but both Euripidēs and Apollodōrus said that Erechtheus was only required to sacrifice, and only did sacrifice, *one*, —the other two slew themselves voluntarily, from affection for their sister. I cannot but think (in spite of the opinion of Welcker to the contrary, *Griechisch. Tragöd.* ii. p. 722) that the genuine legend represented Erechtheus as having sacrificed all three, as appears in the *Iōn* of Euripidēs (276)—

Iōn. Πατὴρ Ἐρεχθεὺς σᾶς ἔθυσε συγγόνους;
CREŪSA. Ἐτὴν πρὸ γαίας σφάγια παρθένους κτανεῖν.
Iōn. Σὺ δὲ ἔξεσώθης πῶς καστυγήτω μόνη;
CREŪSA. Βρέφος νεογονού μητρός δὲν ἐν ἀγκάλαις.

Compare with this passage, *Demosthen. Λόγος Ἐπιτάφ.* p. 1397, Reisk. Just before, the death of the three daughters of Kekrops, for infringing the commands of Athēnē, had been mentioned. Euripidēs modified this in his Erechtheus, for he there introduced the mother Praxitheia consenting to the immolation of one daughter, for the rescue of the country from a foreign invader: to propose to a mother the immolation of three daughters at once, would have been too revolting. In most instances we find the strongly marked features, the distinct and glaring incidents as well as the dark contrasts, belong to the Hesiodic or old post-Homeric legend; the changes made afterwards go to soften, dilute, and to complicate, in proportion as the feelings of the public become milder and more humane; sometimes however the later poets add new horrors.

³ See the striking evidence contained in the oration of Lykurgus against Leocratēs (p. 201–204, Reisk; *Demosthen. Λόγ. Ἐπιτάφ.* 1. c.; and *Xenophōn. Memor.* iii. 5, 9): from the two latter passages we see that the Athenian story represented the invasion under Eumolpus as a combined assault from the western continent.

and reign of Erechtheus, who was (it seems) slain in the battle. He was succeeded by his son Kekrops II., and the latter again by his son Pandiôn II.,¹—two names unmarked by any incidents, and which appear to be mere duplication of the former Kekrops and Pandiôn, placed there by the genealogisers for the purpose of filling up what seemed to them a chronological chasm.

Apollodôrus passes at once from Erechtheus to his son Kekrops II., then to Pandiôn II., next to the four sons of the latter, Ægeus, Pallas, Nisus and Lykus. But the tragedians here insert the story of Xuthus, Kreüsa, and Iôn; the latter being the son of Kreüsa by Apollo, but given by the god to Xuthus, and adopted by the latter as his own. Iôn becomes the successor of Erechtheus, and his sons (Teleon, Hoplês, Argadês, and Aigikorês) become the eponyms of the four ancient tribes of Athens, which subsisted until the revolution of Kleisthenês. Iôn himself is the eponym of the Iônic race both in Asia, in Europe, and in the Ægean islands: Dôrus and Achæus are the sons of Kreüsa by Xuthus, so that Iôn is distinguished from both of them by being of divine parentage.² According to the story given by Philochorus, Iôn rendered such essential service in rescuing the Athenians from the attack of the Thracians under Eumolpus, that he was afterwards made king of the country, and distributed all the inhabitants into four tribes or castes, corresponding to different modes of life,—soldiers, husbandmen, goatherds, and artisans.³ And it seems that the legend explanatory of the origin of the festival Boêdomia, originally important enough to furnish a name to one of the Athenian months, was attached to the aid thus rendered by Iôn.⁴

We pass from Iôn to persons of far greater mythical dignity and interest,—Ægeus and his son Thêseus.

Pandiôn had four sons, Ægeus, Nisus, Lykus, and Pallas, between whom he divided his dominions. Nisus received the territory of Megaris, which had been under the sway of Pandiôn, and there founded the seaport of Nisæa. Lykus was made king of the eastern coast, but a dispute afterwards ensued, and he quitted the country altogether, to establish himself on the

¹ Apollodôr. iii. 15, 5; Eurip. Iôn, 282; Erechth. Fragm. 20, Dindorf.

² Eurip. Iôn, 1570–1595. The Kreüsa of Sophoklês, a lost tragedy, seems to have related to the same subject.

Pausanias (vii. 1, 2) tells us that Xuthus was chosen to arbitrate between the contending claims of the sons of Erechtheus.

³ Philochor. ap. Harpocrat. v. Βοηδρόμια; Strabo, viii. p. 383.

⁴ Philochor. ap. Harpocrat. v. Βοηδρόμια.

southern coast of Asia Minor, among the Termilæ, to whom he gave the name of Lykians.¹ Ægeus, as the eldest of the four, became king of Athens; but Pallas received a portion both of the south-western coast and the interior, and he as well as his children appear as frequent enemies both to Ægeus and to Théseus. Pallas is the eponym of the dème Pallénê, and the stories respecting him and his sons seem to be connected with old and standing feuds among the different dèmes of Attica, originally independent communities. These feuds penetrated into the legend. They explain the story which we find that Ægeus and Théseus were not genuine Erechtheids, the former being denominated a supposititious child to Pandiôn.²

Ægeus³ has little importance in the mythical history except as the father of Théseus: it may even be doubted whether his name is anything more than a mere cognomen of the god Poseidôn, who was (as we are told) the real father of this great Attic Héraklês. As I pretend only to give a very brief outline of the general territory of Grecian legend, I cannot permit myself to recount in detail the chivalrous career of Théseus, who is found both in the Kalydônian boar-hunt and in the Argonautic expedition—his personal and victorious encounters with the robbers Sinnis, Prokrustês, Periphêtês, Skiron, and others—his valuable service in ridding his country of the Krommyonian sow and the Marathônian bull—his conquest of the Minotaur in Krête, and his escape from the dangers of the labyrinth by the aid of Ariadnê, whom he subsequently carries off and abandons—his many amorous adventures, and his expeditions both against the Amazons and into the under-world along with Peirithous.⁴

¹ Sophokl. ap. Strab. ix. p. 392; Herodot. i. 173; Strabo, xii. p. 573.

² Plutarch, Théseus, c. 13. *Αἴγευς θετὸς γενόμενος Πανδίονι, καὶ μηδέν τοῖς Ἐρεχθίδαις προσήκων.* Apollodör. iii. 15, 6.

³ Ægeus had by Mèdeia (who took refuge at Athens after her flight from Corinth) a son named Médus, who passed into Asia, and was considered as the eponymus and progenitor of the Median people. Datis, the general, who commanded the invading Persian army at the battle of Marathôn, sent a formal communication to the Athenians announcing himself as the descendant of Médus, and requiring to be admitted as king of Attica: such is the statement of Diodorûs (Exc. Vatic. vii.-x. 48: see also Schol. Aristophan. Pac. 289).

⁴ Ovid, Metamorph. vii. 433—

“ Te, maxime Theseu,
Mirata est Marathon Cretæi sanguine Tauri:
Quodque Suis securis arat Cromyona colonus,
Munus opusque tuum est. Tellus Epidauria per te
Clavigeram vidit Vulcani occumbere prolem:
Vidit et immanem Cephisia orা Procrustem.
Cercyonis letum vidit Cerealis Eleusin.
Occidit ille Sinis,” &c.

Thucydidēs delineates the character of Thēseus as a man who combined sagacity with political power, and who conferred upon his country the inestimable benefit of uniting all the separate and self-governing dēmes of Attica into one common political society.¹ From the well-earned reverence attached to the assertion of Thucydidēs, it has been customary to reason upon this assertion as historically authentic, and to treat the romantic attributes which we find in Plutarch and Diodōrus as if they were fiction superinduced upon this basis of fact. Such a view of the case is in my judgement erroneous. The athletic and amorous knight-errant is the old version of the character—the profound and long-sighted politician is a subsequent correction, introduced indeed by men of superior mind, but destitute of historical warranty, and arising out of their desire to find reasons of their own for concurring in the veneration which the general public paid more easily and heartily to their national hero. Thēseus, in the Iliad and Odyssey, fights with the Lapithæ against the Centaurs: Thēseus, in the Hesiodic poems, is misguided by his passion for the beautiful Ægлē, daughter of Panopeus:² and the Thēseus described in Plutarch's biography is in great part a continuation and expansion of these same or similar attributes, mingled with many local legends, explaining, like the Fasti of Ovid, or the lost Aitia of Kallimachus, the original genesis of prevalent religious and social customs.³ Plutarch has doubtless greatly softened down and modified the adventures which he found in the Attic logographers, as well as in the poetical epics called Thēsēis. For in his preface to the life of Thēseus, after having emphatically declared that he is about to transcend the boundary both of the known and the knowable, but that the temptation of comparing the founder of Athens with the founder of Rome is irresistible, he concludes with the following remarkable words:

Respecting the amours of Thēseus, Ister especially seems to have entered into great details; but some of them were noticed both in the Hesiodic poems and by Kekrops, not to mention Pherekydēs (Athen. xiii. p. 557). Peirithous, the intimate friend and companion of Thēseus, is the eponymous hero of the Attic dēme or gens Perithoidæ (Ephorus ap. Photium. v. Περιθοίδαι).

¹ Thucyd. ii. 15. Ἐπειδὴ δὲ Θησεὺς ἐβασίλευσε, γενόμενος μετὰ τοῦ ξυνετοῦ καὶ δυνατὸς, τὰ τε ἄλλα διεκόσμησε τὴν χώραν, καὶ καταλύσας τὰν ἄλλων πόλεων τὰ τε βουλευτήρια καὶ τὰς ἀρχὰς, ἐς τὴν νῦν πόλιν. . . . ξυνφίσε πάντας.

² Iliad. i. 265; Odyss. xi. 321. I do not notice the suspected line. Odyss. xi. 630.

³ Diodōrus also, from his disposition to assimilate Thēseus to Hēraklēs, has given us his chivalrous as well as his political attributes (iv. 61).

“I pray that this fabulous matter may be so far obedient to my endeavours as to receive, when purified by reason, the aspect of history: in those cases where it haughtily scorns plausibility and will admit no alliance with what is probable, I shall beg for indulgent hearers, willing to receive antique narrative in a mild spirit.”¹ We here see that Plutarch sat down, not to recount the old fables as he found them, but to purify them by reason and to impart to them the aspect of history. We have to thank him for having retained, after this purification, so much of what is romantic and marvellous; but we may be sure that the sources from which he borrowed were more romantic and marvellous still. It was the tendency of the enlightened men of Athens, from the days of Solôn downwards, to refine and politicise the character of Thêseus:² even Peisistratus expunged from one of the Hesiodic poems the line which described the violent passion of the hero for the fair Ægîlê:³ and the tragic poets found it more congenial to the feelings of their audience to exhibit him as a dignified and liberal sovereign, rather than as an adventurous single-handed fighter. But the logographers and the Alexandrine poets remained more faithful to the old fables. The story of Hekalê, the hospitable old woman who received and blessed Thêseus when he went against the Marathônian bull, and whom he found dead when he came back to recount the news of his success, was treated by Kallimachus:⁴ and Virgil must have had his mind full of the unrefined legends, when he numbered this Attic Hêraklês among the unhappy sufferers condemned to endless penance in the under-world.⁵

¹ Plutarch, Thêseus, i. Εἴη μὲν οὖν ἡμῖν, ἐκκαθαιρέμενον λόγῳ τὸ μυθῶδες ὑπακοῦσαι καὶ λαβεῖν ἵστορας ὅψιν· δπον δὲν αὐθάδως τοῦ πιθανοῦ περιφρονῆ, καὶ μὴ δέχηται τὴν πρὸς τὸ εἰκὸς μίξιν, εὐγνωμόνων ἀκροατῶν δεησόμεθα, καὶ πρᾶς τὴν ἀρχαιολογίαν προσδεχομένων.

² See Isokratê, Panathenaic. (t. ii. p. 510-512, Auger); Xenoph. Memor. iii. 5, 10. In the Helenæ Encomium, Isokratê enlarges more upon the personal exploits of Thêseus in conjunction with his great political merits (t. ii. p. 342-350, Auger).

³ Plutarch, Thêseus, 20.

⁴ See the epigram of Krinagoras, Antholog. Pal. vol. ii. p. 144; ep. xv. ed. Brunck. and Kallimach. Frag. 40—

‘Δεῖδε δ’ (Kallimachus) Ἐκάλης τε φιλοξείνοιο καλήν,
Καὶ Θησέων οὐς ἐπέθηκε πόνους.

Some beautiful lines are preserved by Suidas, v. Ἐπαύλια, περὶ Ἐκάλης θαυμάστης (probably spoken by Thêseus himself, see Plutarch, Thêseus, c. 14).

‘Ιθι, πρησία γυναικῶν,
Τὴν ὁδὸν, ἥν ἀνία θυμαλγέει οὐ περόσωτι·
Πολλάκι σεῖ, ὡ μαῖα, φιλοξείνοιο καλῆς·
Μηνόσμεθα· ἔνιον γαρ ἐπαύλιον ἔσκει ἀπασι.

⁵ Virgil, Æneid, vi. 617. “Sedet æternumque sedebit Infelix Thêseus.”

Two however among the Thessian fables cannot be dismissed without some special notice,—the war against the Amazons, and the expedition against Krête. The former strikingly illustrates the facility as well as the tenacity of Grecian legendary faith; the latter embraces the story of Dædalus and Minos, two of the most eminent among Grecian ante-historical personages.

The Amazons, daughters of Arès and Harmonia,¹ are both early creations, and frequent reproductions, of the ancient epic—which was indeed, we may generally remark, largely occupied both with the exploits and sufferings of women, or heroines, the wives and daughters of the Grecian heroes—and which recognised in Pallas Athénê the finished type of an irresistible female warrior. A nation of courageous, hardy and indefatigable women, dwelling apart from men, permitting only a short temporary intercourse for the purpose of renovating their numbers, and burning out their right breast with a view of enabling themselves to draw the bow freely,—this was at once a general type stimulating to the fancy of the poet, and a theme eminently popular with his hearers. Nor was it at all repugnant to the faith of the latter, who had no recorded facts to guide them, and no other standard of credibility as to the past except such poetical narratives themselves—to conceive communities of Amazons as having actually existed in anterior time. Accordingly we find these warlike females constantly reappearing in the ancient poems, and universally accepted as past realities. In the Iliad, when Priam wishes to illustrate emphatically the most numerous host in which he ever found himself included, he tells us that it was assembled in Phrygia, on the banks of the Sangarius, for the purpose of resisting the formidable Amazons. When Bellerophôn is to be employed on a deadly and perilous undertaking,² by those who indirectly wish to procure his death, he is despatched against the Amazons. In the *Æthiopis* of Arktinus, describing the post-Homeric war of Troy, Penthesileia, queen of the Amazons, appears as the most effective ally of the besieged city, and as the most formidable enemy of the Greeks, succumbing only to the invincible might of Achilles.³ The Argonautic heroes find the Amazons

¹ Pherekyd. *Fragm.* 25, Didot.

² Iliad, iii. 186; vi. 152.

³ See Proclus's Argument of the lost *Æthiopis* (*Fragm. Epicor. Greecor. ed.* Dūntzer, p. 16). We are reduced to the first book of Quintus Smyrnæus for some idea of the valour of Penthesileia: it is supposed to be copied more or less closely from the *Æthiopis*. See Tychsen's Dissertation prefixed to his edition of Quintus, sections 5 and 12. Compare Dio. Chrysostom. *Or.* xi. p. 350, Reisk. Philostratus (*Heroica*, c. 19, p. 751)

on the river Thermôdôn, in their expedition along the southern coast of the Euxine. To the same spot Hêraklês goes to attack them, in the performance of the ninth labour imposed upon him by Eurystheus, for the purpose of procuring the girdle of the Amazonian queen Hippolytê;¹ and we are told that they had not yet recovered from the losses sustained in this severe aggression when Thêseus also assaulted and defeated them, carrying off their queen Antiopê.² This injury they avenged by invading Attica,—an undertaking (as Plutarch justly observes) “neither trifling nor feminine,” especially if, according to the statement of Hellanikus, they crossed the Cimmerian Bosphorus on the winter ice, beginning their march from the Asiatic side of the Palus Mæotis.³ They overcame all the resistances and difficulties of this prodigious march, and penetrated even into Athens itself: where the final battle, hard-fought and at one time doubtful, by which Thêseus crushed them, was fought—in the very heart of the city. Attic antiquaries confidently pointed out the exact position of the two contending armies: the left wing of the Amazons rested upon the spot

gives a strange transformation of this old epic narrative into a descent of Amazons upon the island sacred to Achilles.

¹ Apollôn. Rhod. ii. 966, 1004; Apollod. ii. 5-9; Diodôr. ii. 46; iv. 16. The Amazons were supposed to speak the Thracian language (Schol. Apoll. Rhod. ii. 953), though some authors asserted them to be natives of Libya, others of Æthiopia (*ib.* 965).

Hellanikus (Fragm. 33, ap. Schol. Pindar. Nem. iii. 65) said that all the Argonauts had assisted Hêraklês in this expedition: the fragment of the old epic poem (perhaps the *'Αμαζόνια*) there quoted mentions Telamôn specially.

² The many diversities in the story respecting Thêseus and the Amazon Antiopê are well set forth in Bachet de Meziriac (*Commentaires sur Ovide*, t. i. p. 317).

Welcker (*Der Epische Cyclus*, p. 313) supposes that the ancient epic poem, called by Suidas *'Αμαζόνια*, related to the invasion of Attica by the Amazons, and that this poem is the same, under another title, as the *'Ατθοί* of Hegesinoüs cited by Pausanias: I cannot say that he establishes this conjecture satisfactorily, but the chapter is well worth consulting. The epic Thêséis seems to have given a version of the Amazonian contest in many respects different from that which Plutarch has put together out of the logographers (see Plut. Thês. 28): it contained a narrative of many unconnected exploits belonging to Thêseus, and Aristotle censures it on that account as ill-constructed (*Poetic. c. 17*).

The *'Αμαζόνια* or *'Αμαζονικὰ* of Onasus can hardly have been (as Heyne supposes, ad Apollod. ii. 5, 9) an epic poem: we may infer from the rationalising tendency of the citation from it (Schol. ad Theocrit. xiii. 46, and Schol. Apollôn. Rhod. i. 1207) that it was a work in prose. There was an *'Αμαζόνια* by Possis of Magnésia (Athenæus, vii. p. 296).

³ Plutarch, Thêseus, 27. Pindar (*Olymp. xiii. 84*) represents the Amazons as having come from the extreme north, when Bellerophôn conquers them.

occupied by the commemorative monument called the Amazoneion; the right wing touched the Pnyx, the place in which the public assemblies of the Athenian democracy were afterwards held. The details and fluctuations of the combat, as well as the final triumph and consequent truce, were recounted by these authors with as complete faith and as much circumstantiality as those of the battle of Platæa by Herodotus. The sepulchral edifice called the Amazoneion, the tomb or pillar of Antiopē near the western gate of the city—the spot called the Horkomosion near the temple of Théseus—even the hill of Areiopagus itself, and the sacrifices which it was customary to offer to the Amazons at the periodical festival of the Thēseia—were all so many religious mementos of this victory;¹ which was moreover a favourite subject of art both with the sculptor and the painter, at Athens as well as in other parts of Greece.

No portion of the ante-historical epic appears to have been more deeply worked into the national mind of Greece than this invasion and defeat of the Amazons. It was not only a constant theme of the logographers, but was also familiarly appealed to by the popular orators along with Marathōn and Salamis, among those antique exploits of which their fellow-citizens might justly be proud. It formed a part of the retrospective faith of Herodotus, Lysias, Plato and Isokratēs,² and the exact

¹ Plutarch, Théseus, 27-28; Pausan. i. 2, 4; Plato, Axiochus, c. 2; Harpocratiōn, v. Ἀμαζονεῖον; Aristophan. Lysistrat. 678, with the Scholia. Aeschyl. (Eumenid. 685) says that the Amazons assaulted the citadel from the Areiopagus—

Πάγον τ' Ἀρειον τόνδ', Ἀμαζόνων ἔδραν
Σκηνάς θ, ὅτ' θλον Θησέως κατὰ φθόνον
Στρατηλατοῦσα, καὶ πόλιν νεότοποιν
Τῆνδ' ὑψίτυργον ἀντεπύρωσαν ποτε.

² Herodot. ix. 27. Lysias (Epitaph. c. 3) represents the Amazons as ἄρχουσαι πολλῶν θυνων: the whole race, according to him, was nearly extinguished in their unsuccessful and calamitous invasion of Attica. Isokratēs (Panegyric. t. i. p. 206, Auger) says the same: also Panathēnaic. t. iii. p. 560, Auger; Demosth. Epitaph. p. 1391, Reisk. Pausanias quotes Pindar's notice of the invasion, and with the fullest belief of its historical reality (vii. 2. 4). Plato mentions the invasion of Attica by the Amazons in the Menexenus (c. 9), but the passage in the treatise De Legg. c. ii. p. 804,— ἀκούων γὰρ δὴ μύθους παλαιοὺς πέπεισμαι, &c.—is even a stronger evidence of his own belief. And Xenophōn, in the Anabasis, when he compares the quiver and the hatchet of his barbarous enemies to “those which the Amazons carry,” evidently believed himself to be speaking of real persons, though he could have seen only the costumes and armature of those painted by Mikōn and others (Anabas. iv. 4, 10; compare Aeschyl. Supplic. 293, and Aristophan. Lysistr. 678; Lucian, Anachars. c. 34, v. iii. p. 318).

How copiously the tale was enlarged upon by the authors of the Attides, we see in Plutarch, Théseus, 27-28.

date of the event was settled by the chronologists.¹ Nor did the Athenians stand alone in such a belief. Throughout many other regions of Greece, both European and Asiatic, traditions and memorials of the Amazons were found. At Megara, at Trœzen, in Laconia near Cape Tænarus, at Chæroneia in Bœotia, and in more than one part of Thessaly, sepulchres or monuments of the Amazons were preserved. The warlike women (it was said), on their way to Attica, had not traversed those countries without leaving some evidences of their passage.²

Amongst the Asiatic Greeks the supposed traces of the Amazons were yet more numerous. Their proper territory was asserted to be the town and plain of Themiskyra, near the Grecian colony of Amisus, on the river Thermôdôn, a region called after their name by Roman historians and geographers.³ But they were believed to have conquered and occupied in earlier times a much wider range of territory, extending even to the coast of Iônia and Æolis. Ephesus, Smyrna, Kymê, Myrina, Paphos and Sinopê were affirmed to have been founded and denominated by them.⁴ Some authors placed them in Libya or Ethiopia; and when the Pontic Greeks on the north-western shore of the Euxine had become acquainted with the hardy and daring character of the

Hekataeus (ap. Steph. Byz. *'Αμαζονεῖον*; also Fragm. 350, 351, 352, Didot) and Xanthus (ap. Hesychium, v. *Βουλεψῆ*) both treated of the Amazons: the latter passage ought to be added to the collection of the Fragments of Xanthus by Didot.

¹ Clemens Alexandr. Stromat. i. p. 336; Marmor. Parium, Epoch. 21.

² Plutarch, Thês. 27–28. Steph. Byz. v. *'Αμαζονεῖον*. Pausan. ii. 32, 8; iii. 25, 2.

³ Pherekydês ap. Schol. Apollon. Rh. ii. 373–992; Justin, ii. 4; Strabo, xii. p. 547. Θεμίστκυραν, τὸ τῶν Ἀμαζόνων οἰκητήριον; Diodor. ii. 45–46; Sallust ap. Serv. ad Virgil. Æneid. xi. 659; Pompon. Mela, i. 19; Plin. H. N. vi. 4. The geography of Quintus Curtius (vi. 4) and of Philostratus (Heroic. c. 19) is on this point indefinite, and even inconsistent.

⁴ Ephor. Fragm. 87, Didot. Strabo, xi. p. 505; xii. p. 573; xiii. p. 622. Pausan. iv. 31, 6; vii. 2, 4. Tacit. Ann. iii. 61. Schol. Apollon. Rhod. ii. 965.

The derivation of the name Sinopê from an Amazon was given by Hekataeus (Fragm. 352). Themiskyra also had one of the Amazons for its eponymus (Appian, Bell. Mithridat. 78).

Some of the most venerated religious legends at Sinopê were attached to the expedition of Hêraklês against the Amazons: Autolykus, the oracle-giving hero, worshipped with great solemnity even at the time when the town was besieged by Lucullus, was the companion of Hêraklês (Appian, ib. c. 83). Even a small mountain village in the territory of Ephesus, called Latoreia, derived its name from one of the Amazons (Athenæ. i. p. 31).

Sarmatian maidens,—who were obliged to have slain each an enemy in battle as the condition of obtaining a husband, and who artificially prevented the growth of the right breast during childhood,—they could imagine no more satisfactory mode of accounting for such attributes than by deducing the Sarmatians from a colony of vagrant Amazons, expelled by the Grecian heroes from their territory on the Thermôdôn.¹ Pindar ascribed the first establishment of the memorable temple of Artemis at Ephesus to the Amazons. And Pausanias explains in part the pre-eminence which this temple enjoyed over every other in Greece by the widely diffused renown of its female founders,² respecting whom he observes (with perfect truth, if we admit the historical character of the old epic), that women possess an unparalleled force of resolution in resisting adverse events, since the Amazons, after having been first roughly handled by Hêraklês, and then completely defeated by Thêseus, could yet find courage to play so conspicuous a part in the defence of Troy against the Grecian besiegers.³

It is thus that in what is called early Grecian history, as the Greeks themselves looked back upon it, the Amazons were among the most prominent and undisputed personages. Nor will the circumstance appear wonderful if we reflect, that the belief in them was first established at a time when the Grecian mind was fed with nothing else but religious legend and epic poetry, and that the incidents of the supposed past, as received from these sources, were addressed to their faith and feelings, without being required to adapt themselves to any canons of credibility drawn from present experience. But the time came when the historians of Alexander the Great audaciously abused this ancient credence. Amongst other tales calculated to exalt the dignity of that monarch, they affirmed

¹ Herodot. iv. 108–117, where he gives the long tale imagined by the Pontic Greeks, of the origin of the Sarmatian nation. Compare Hippocratès, De Aëre, Locis et Aquis, c. 17; Ephorus, Fragm. 103; Skymn. Chius, v. 102; Plato, Legg. vii. p. 804; Diodor. ii. 34.

The testimony of Hippokratès certifies the practice of the Sarmatian women to check the growth of the right breast: Τὸν δεξιὸν δὲ μαζὸν οὐκ χρονίσιν. Παιδίοισι γὰρ ἐοῦσιν ἔτι νηπίοισιν αἱ μητέρες χαλκεῖον τετεχημένον ἐπ' αὐτέων τούτων διάπυρον ποιέουσαι, πρὸς τὸν μαζὸν τιθέασι τὸν δεξιὸν· καὶ ἐπικαλεται, ὥστε τὴν αὐξησιν φθείρεσθαι, ἐς δὲ τὸν δεξιὸν ἀμον καὶ βραχίονα πᾶσαν τὴν ἰσχὺν καὶ τὸ πλήθος ἐκδιδόναι.

Ktēsias also compares a warlike Sakian woman to the Amazons (Fragm. Persic. ii. pp. 221, 449, Bähr).

² Pausan. iv. 31, 6; vii. 2, 4. Dionys. Periégêt. 828.

³ Pausan. i. 15, 2.

that after his conquest and subjugation of the Persian empire, he had been visited in Hyrcania by Thalestris, queen of the Amazons, who, admiring his warlike prowess, was anxious to be enabled to return into her own country in a condition to produce offspring of a breed so invincible.¹ But the Greeks had now been accustomed for a century and a half to historical and philosophical criticism—and that uninquiring faith, which was readily accorded to the wonders of the past, could no longer be invoked for them when tendered as present reality. For the fable of the Amazons was here reproduced in its naked simplicity, without being rationalised or painted over with historical colours.

Some literary men indeed, among whom were Dêmétrius of Skepsis, and the Mitylenæan Theophanê, the companion of Pompey in his expeditions, still continued their belief both in Amazons present and Amazons past; and when it became notorious that at least there were none such on the banks of the Thermôdôn, these authors supposed them to have migrated from their original locality, and to have settled in the unvisited regions north of Mount Caucasus.² Strabo, on the contrary, feeling that the grounds of disbelief applied with equal force to the ancient stories and to the modern, rejected both the one and the other. But he remarks at the same time, not without some surprise, that it was usual with most persons to adopt a middle course,—to retain the Amazons as historical phænomena of the remote past, but to disallow them as realities of the present, and to maintain that the breed had died out.³ The accomplished intellect of Julius Cæsar did not

¹ Arrian, *Exped. Alex.* vii. 13; compare iv. 15; Quint. *Curt.* vi. 4; Justin, xlvi. 4. The note of Freinshemius on the above passage of Quintus Curtius is full of valuable references on the subject of the Amazons.

² Strabo, xi. p. 503–504; Appian, *Bell. Mithridat.* c. 103; Plutarch, *Pompeius*, c. 35. Plin. *N. H.* vi. 7. Plutarch still retains the old description of Amazons from the mountains near the Thermôdôn: Appian keeps clear of this geographical error, probably copying more exactly the language of Theophanê, who must have been well aware that when Lucullus besieged Themiskyra, he did not find it defended by the Amazons (see Appian, *Bell. Mithridat.* c. 78). Ptolemy (v. 9) places the Amazons in the imperfectly known regions of Asiatic Sarmatia, north of the Caspian and near the river Rha (Volga). “This fabulous community of women (observes Forbiger, *Handbuch der alten Geographie*, ii. 77, p. 457) was a phænomenon much too interesting for the geographers easily to relinquish.”

³ Strabo, xi. p. 505. “*Ἴδιόν δέ τι συμβέβηκε τῷ λόγῳ περὶ τῶν Ἀμαζόνων. Οἱ μὲν γάρ ἄλλοι τὸ μυθῶδες καὶ τὸ ἱστορικὸν διωρισμένον ἔχουσι· τὰ γὰρ παλαιὰ καὶ ψευδῆ καὶ τερατῶδη, μῦθοι καλοῦνται.*” [Note. Strabo does not always speak of the *μῦθοι* in this disrespectful tone; he is sometimes much displeased with those who dispute the existence of an historical kernel in

scruple to acknowledge them as having once conquered and held in dominion a large portion of Asia.¹ And the compromise between early, traditional, and religious faith on the one hand, and established habits of critical research on the other, adopted by the historian Arrian, deserves to be transcribed in his own words, as illustrating strikingly the powerful sway of the old legends even over the most positive-minded Greeks :—

“Neither Aristobulus nor Ptolemy (he observes), nor any other competent witness, has recounted this (visit of the Amazons and their queen to Alexander) : nor does it seem to me that the race of the Amazons was preserved down to that time, nor have they been noticed either by any one before Alexander, or by Xenophôn, though he mentions both the Phasians and the Kolchians, and the other barbarous nations which the Greeks saw both before and after their arrival at Trapezus, in which marches they must have met with the Amazons, if the latter had been still in existence. Yet *it is incredible to me* that this race of women, celebrated as they have been by authors so many and so commanding, *should never have existed at all*. The story tells of Héraklês, that he set out from Greece and brought back with him the girdle of their queen Hippolytē ; also of Thêseus and the Athenians, that they were the first who defeated in battle and repelled

the inside, especially with regard to Homer.] ή δ' ιστορία βούλεται τάληθες, ἄντε παλαιὸν, ἄντε νέον· καὶ τὸ τερατώδες ή οὐκ ἔχει, ή σπάνιον. Περὶ δὲ τῶν Ἀμαζόνων τὰ αὐτὰ λέγεται καὶ νῦν καὶ πάλαι, τερατώδη τ' ὑπά, καὶ πίστεως πόρρω. Τίς γὰρ ἄν πιστεύειν, ὡς γυναικῶν στράτου, ή πόλις, ή ἔθνος, συσταίν ἄν ποτε χωρὶς ἀνδρῶν ; καὶ οὐ μόνον συσταῖη, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐφόδους ποιήσαιτο ἐπὶ τὴν ἀλλοτρίαν, καὶ κρατήσειν οὐ τῶν ἔγγυς μόνον, ὅστε καὶ μέχρι τῆς νῦν Ἰωνίας προελθεῖν, ἀλλὰ καὶ διαπόντιον στελέσαιτο στρατίαν μέχρι τῆς Ἀττικῆς ; Ἀλλὰ μὴν ταῦτα γε αὐτὰ καὶ νῦν λέγεται περὶ αὐτῶν· ἐπιτείνει δὲ τὴν ἴδιατητα καὶ τὸ πιστεύεσθαι τὰ παλαιὰ μᾶλλον ή τὰ νῦν. There are however other passages in which he speaks of the Amazons as realities.

Justin (ii. 4) recognises the great power and extensive conquests of the Amazons in very early times, but says that they gradually declined down to the reign of Alexander, in whose time there were *just a few remaining* ; the queen with these few visited Alexander, but shortly afterwards the whole breed became extinct. This hypothesis has the merit of convenience, perhaps of ingenuity.

¹ Suetonius, Jul. Cæsar, c. 22. “In Syriâ quoque regnasse Semiramin (Julius Caesar said this), magnamque Asiæ partem Amazonas tenuisse quondam.”

In the splendid triumph of the emperor Aurelian at Rome after the defeat of Zenobia, a few Gothic women who had been taken in arms were exhibited among the prisoners ; the official placard carried along with them announced them as *Amazons* (Vopiscus Aurel. in Histor. August. Scrip. p. 260, ed. Paris).

these women in their invasion of Europe; and the combat of the Athenians with the Amazons has been painted by Mikôn, not less than that between the Athenians and the Persians. Moreover Herodotus has spoken in many places of these women, and those Athenian orators who have pronounced panegyrics on the citizens slain in battle, have dwelt upon the victory over the Amazons as among the most memorable of Athenian exploits. If the satrap of Media sent any equestrian women at all to Alexander, I think that they must have come from some of the neighbouring barbarous tribes, practised in riding and equipped in the costume generally called Amazonian.”¹

There cannot be a more striking evidence of the indelible force with which these ancient legends were worked into the national faith and feelings of the Greeks, than these remarks of a judicious historian upon the fable of the Amazons. Probably if any plausible mode of rationalising it, and of transforming it into a quasi-political event, had been offered to Arrian, he would have been better pleased to adopt such a middle term, and would have rested comfortably in the supposition that he believed the legend in its true meaning, while his less inquiring countrymen were imposed upon by the exaggerations of poets. But as the story was presented to him plain and unvarnished, either for acceptance or rejection, his feelings as a patriot and a religious man prevented him from applying to the past such tests of credibility as his untrammelled reason acknowledged to be paramount in regard to the present. When we see moreover how much his belief was strengthened, and all tendency to scepticism shut out, by the familiarity of his eye and memory with sculptured or painted Amazons²—we may calculate the irresistible force of this sensible demonstration on the convictions of the unlettered public, at once more deeply retentive of passive impressions, and unaccustomed to the countervailing habit of rational investigation into evidence. Had the march of an army of warlike women, from the Thermôdôn or the Tanais into the heart of Attica, been recounted to Arrian as an incident belonging to the time of Alexander the Great, he would have rejected it no less emphatically than Strabô; but cast back as it was into an

¹ Arrian, *Expedit. Alexand.* vii. 13.

² Ktësias described as real animals, existing in wild and distant regions, the heterogeneous and fantastic combinations which he saw sculptured in the East (see this stated and illustrated in Bähr, *Preface to the Fragm. of Ktësias*, pp. 58, 59).

undefined past, it took rank among the hallowed traditions of divine or heroic antiquity,—gratifying to extol by rhetoric, but repulsive to scrutinise in argument.¹

CHAPTER XII

KRETAN LEGENDS—MINOS AND HIS FAMILY

To understand the adventures of Thêseus in Krête, it will be necessary to touch briefly upon Minôs and the Krêtan heroic genealogy.

Minôs and Rhadamanthus, according to Homer, are sons of

¹ Heyne observes (Apollodôr, ii. 5, 9) with respect to the fable of the Amazons, “In his historiarum fidem aut vestigia nemo quæsiverit.” Admitting the wisdom of this counsel (and I think it indisputable), why are we required to presume, in the absence of all proof, an historical basis for each of those *other* narratives, such as the Kalydônian boar-hunt, the Argonautic expedition, or the siege of Troy, which go to make up, along with the story of the Amazons, the aggregate matter of Grecian legendary faith? If the tale of the Amazons could gain currency without any such support, why not other portions of the ancient epic?

An author of easy belief, Dr. F. Nagel, vindicates the historical reality of the Amazons (Geschichte der Amazonen, Stuttgart, 1838). I subjoin here a different explanation of the Amazonian tale, proceeding from another author who rejects the historical basis, and contained in a work of learning and value (Guhl, *Ephesiaca*, Berlin, 1843, p. 132)—

“Id tantum monendum videtur, Amazonas nequaquam historice accipendas esse, sed e contrario totas ad mythologiam pertinere. Earum enim fabulas quum ex frequentium hierodularum gregibus in cultibus et sacris Asiaticis ortas esse ingeniose ostenderit Tolken, jam *inter omnes mythologiaz peritos constat*, Amazonibus nihil fere nisi peregrini cujusdam cultûs notionem expressum esse, ejusque cum Græcorum religione certamen frequentibus istis pugnis designatum esse, quas cum Amazonibus tot Græcorum heroes habuisse credebantur, Hercules, Bellerophon, Theseus, Achilles, et vel ipse, quem Ephesi cultum fuisse supra ostendimus, Dionysus. Quæ Amazonum notio primaria, quum paulatim Euemeristicâ (ut ita dicam) ratione ita transformaretur, ut Amazones pro vero seminarum populo haberentur, necesse quoque erat, ut omnibus fere locis, ubi ejusmodi religionum certamina locum habuerunt, Amazones habitasse, vel eo usque processisse, crederentur. Quod cum nusquam manifestius fuerit, quam in Asiâ minore, et potissimum in eâ parte quæ Græciam versus vergit, haud mirandum est omnes fere ejus oræ urbes ab Amazonibus conditas putari.”

I do not know the evidence upon which this conjectural interpretation rests, but the statement of it, though it boasts so many supporters among mythological critics, carries no appearance of probability to my mind. Priam fights against the Amazons as well as the Grecian heroes.

Zeus, by Europê,¹ daughter of the widely-celebrated Phœnix, born in Krête. Minôs is the father of Deukaliôn, whose son Idomeneus, in conjunction with Mérionês, conducts the Krêtan troops to the host of Agamemnôn before Troy. Minôs is ruler of Knossus, and familiar companion of the great Zeus. He is spoken of as holding guardianship in Krête—not necessarily meaning the whole of the island: he is farther decorated with a golden sceptre, and constituted judge over the dead in the under-world to settle their disputes, in which function Odysseus finds him—this however by a passage of comparatively late interpolation into the *Odyssey*. He also had a daughter named Ariadnê, for whom the artist Dædalus fabricated in the town of Knossus the representation of a complicated dance, and who was ultimately carried off by Thêseus: she died in the island of Dia, deserted by Thêseus and betrayed by Dionysos to the fatal wrath of Artemis. Rhadamanthus seems to approach to Minôs both in judicial functions and posthumous dignity. He is conveyed expressly to Eubœa, by the semi-divine sea-carriers the Phœaciens, to inspect the gigantic corpse of the earth-born Tityus—the longest voyage they ever undertook. He is moreover after death promoted to an abode of undisturbed bliss in the Elysian plain at the extremity of the earth.²

According to poets later than Homer, Europê is brought over by Zeus from Phœnicia to Krête, where she bears to him three sons, Minôs, Rhadamanthus and Sarpêdôn. The latter leaves Krête and settles in Lykia, the population of which, as well as that of many other portions of Asia Minor, is connected by various mythical genealogies with Krête, though the Sarpêdôn of the *Iliad* has no connexion with Krête, and is not the

¹ Europê was worshipped with very peculiar solemnity in the island of Krête (see Dictys Cretensis, *De Bello Trojano*, i. c. 2).

The venerable plane-tree, under which Zeus and Europê had reposed, was still shown, hard by a fountain at Gortyn in Krête, in the time of Theophrastus: it was said to be the only plane-tree in the neighbourhood which never cast its leaves (Theophrast. *Hist. Plant.* i. 9).

² Homer, *Iliad*, xiii. 249, 450; xiv. 321. *Odyss.* xi. 322-568; xix. 179; iv. 564-vii. 321.

The Homeric Minôs in the under-world is not a judge of the previous lives of the dead, so as to determine whether they deserve reward or punishment for their conduct on earth: such functions are not assigned to him earlier than the time of Plato. He administers justice *among* the dead, who are conceived as a sort of society, requiring some presiding judge: θεμιστεύοντα νεκύεσσι, with regard to Minôs, is said very much like (*Odyss.* xi. 484) νῦν δ' αὐτε μέγα κρατέεις νεκύεσσι with regard to Achilles. See this matter partially illustrated in Heyne's *Excursus xi.* to the sixth book of the *Aeneid* of Virgil.

son of Europê. Sarpêdôn, having become king of Lykia, was favoured by his father, Zeus, with permission to live for three generations.¹ At the same time the youthful Milêtus, a favourite of Sarpêdôn, quitted Krête, and established the city which bore his name on the coast of Asia Minor. Rhadamanthus became sovereign of and lawgiver among the islands in the Ægean: he subsequently went to Boeôtia, where he married the widowed Alkmênê, mother of Héraklês.

Europê finds in Krête a king Astêrius, who marries her and adopts her children by Zeus; this Astêrius is the son of Krês, the eponym of the island, or (according to another genealogy by which it was attempted to be made out that Minôs was of Dôrian race) he was a son of the daughter of Krês by Tektamus, the son of Dôrus, who had migrated into the island from Greece.

Minôs married Pasiphaê, daughter of the god Hêlios and Perseïs, by whom he had Katreus, Deukaliôn, Glaukus, Androgeos,—names marked in the legendary narrative,—together with several daughters, among whom were Ariadnê and Phædra. He offended Poseidôn by neglecting to fulfil a solemnly-made vow, and the displeased god afflicted his wife Pasiphaê with a monstrous passion for a bull. The great artist Dædalus, son of Eupalamus, a fugitive from Athens, became the confidant of this amour, from which sprang the Minôtaur, a creature half-man and half-bull.² This Minôtaur was imprisoned by Minôs in the labyrinth, an inextricable enclosure constructed by Dædalus for that express purpose by order of Minôs.

Minôs acquired great nautical power, and expelled the Karian inhabitants from many of the islands of the Ægean, which he placed under the government of his sons on the footing of tributaries. He undertook several expeditions against various places on the coast—one against Nisus, the son of Pandiôn, king of Megara, who had amongst the hair of his head one peculiar lock of a purple colour: an oracle had pronounced that his life and reign would never be in danger so long as he preserved this precious lock. The city would

¹ Apollodôr. iii. 1, 2. *Καὶ αὐτῷ δίδωσι Ζεὺς ἐπὶ τρεῖς γενεὰς ζῆν.* This circumstance is evidently imagined by the logographers to account for the appearance of Sarpêdôn in the Trojan war, fighting against Idomeneus, the grandson of Minôs. Nisus is the eponymus of Nisaea, the port of the town of Megara: his tomb was shown at Athens (Pausan. i. 19, 5). Minôs is the eponym of the island of Minoa (opposite the port of Nisaea), where it was affirmed that the fleet of Minôs was stationed (Pausan. i. 44, 5).

² Apollodôr. iii. 1, 2.

have remained inexpugnable, if *Skylla*, the daughter of *Nisus*, had not conceived a violent passion for *Minôs*. While her father was asleep, she cut off the lock on which his safety hung, so that the Krêtan king soon became victorious. Instead of performing his promise to carry *Skylla* away with him to Krête, he cast her from the stern of his vessel into the sea:¹ both *Skylla* and *Nisus* were changed into birds.

Androgeos, son of *Minôs*, having displayed such rare qualities as to vanquish all his competitors at the Panathenaic festival in Athens, was sent by *Ægeus* the Athenian king to contend against the bull of *Marathôn*,—an enterprise in which he perished, and *Minôs* made war upon Athens to avenge his death. He was for a long time unable to take the city: at length he prayed to his father *Zeus* to aid him in obtaining redress from the Athenians, and *Zeus* sent upon them pestilence and famine. In vain did they endeavour to avert these calamities by offering up as propitiatory sacrifices the four daughters of *Hyakinthus*. Their sufferings still continued and the oracle directed them to submit to any terms which *Minôs* might exact. He required that they should send to Krête a tribute of seven youths and seven maidens, periodically, to be devoured by the *Minôtaur*,²—offered to him in a labyrinth constructed by *Dædalus*, including countless different passages, out of which no person could escape.

Every ninth year this offering was to be despatched. The more common story was, that the youths and maidens thus destined to destruction were selected by lot—but the logo-grapher *Hellanikus* said that *Minôs* came to Athens and chose them himself.³ The third period for despatching the victims had arrived, and Athens was plunged in the deepest affliction, when *Thêseus* determined to devote himself as one of them, and either to terminate the sanguinary tribute or to perish. He prayed to *Poseidôn* for help, while the Delphian god assured him that *Aphroditê* would sustain and extricate him. On arriving at *Knossus* he was fortunate enough to captivate

¹ *Apollodôr.* iii. 15, 8. See the *Ciris* of *Virgil*, a juvenile poem on the subject of this fable; also *Hyginus*, f. 198; *Schol.* *Eurip.* *Hippol.* 1200. *Propertius* (iii. 19, 21) gives the features of the story with tolerable fidelity; *Ovid* takes considerable liberties with it (*Metam.* viii. 5-150).

² *Apollodôr.* iii. 15, 8.

³ See, on the subject of *Thêseus* and the *Minôtaur*, *Eckermann*, *Lehrbuch der Religions Geschichte und Mythologie*, vol. ii. ch. xiii. p. 133. He maintains that the tribute of these human victims paid by Athens to *Minôs* is an historical fact. Upon what this belief is grounded, I confess I do not see.

the affections of Ariadnē, the daughter of Minōs, who supplied him with a sword and a clue of thread. With the former he contrived to kill the Minōtaur, the latter served to guide his footsteps in escaping from the labyrinth. Having accomplished this triumph, he left Krête with his ship and companions unhurt, carrying off Ariadnē, whom however he soon abandoned on the island of Naxos. On his way home to Athens, he stopped at Delos, where he offered a grateful sacrifice to Apollo for his escape, and danced, along with the young men and maidens whom he had rescued from the Minōtaur, a dance called the Geranus, imitated from the twists and convolutions of the Krētan labyrinth. It had been concerted with his father Āgeus, that if he succeeded in his enterprise against the Minōtaur, he should on his return hoist white sails in his ship in place of the black canvas which she habitually carried when employed on this mournful embassy. But Thēseus forgot to make the change of sails; so that Āgeus, seeing the ship return with her equipment of mourning unaltered, was impressed with the sorrowful conviction that his son had perished, and cast himself into the sea. The ship which made this voyage was preserved by the Athenians with careful solicitude, being constantly repaired with new timbers, down to the time of the Phalerian Démétrius: every year she was sent from Athens to Delos with a solemn sacrifice and specially-nominated envoys. The priest of Apollo decked her stern with garlands before she quitted the port, and during the time which elapsed until her return, the city was understood to abstain from all acts carrying with them public impurity, so that it was unlawful to put to death any person even under formal sentence by the dikastery. This accidental circumstance becomes especially memorable, from its having postponed for thirty days the death of the lamented Sokrátēs.¹

The legend respecting Thēseus, and his heroic rescue of the seven noble youths and maidens from the jaws of the Minōtaur, was thus both commemorated and certified to the Athenian public, by the annual holy ceremony and by the unquestioned identity of the vessel employed in it. There were indeed many varieties in the mode of narrating the incident; and some of the Attic logographers tried to rationalise the fable by

¹ Plato, Phædon, c. 2, 3; Xenoph. Memor. iv. 8, 2. Plato especially noticed *τοὺς δὲ ἐπτὰ ἑκατόντας*, the seven youths and seven maidens whom Thēseus conveyed to Krête and brought back safely: this number seems an old and constant feature in the legend, maintained by Sappho and Bacchylidēs, as well as by Euripidēs (Herc. Fur. 1318). See Servius ad Virgil. *Aeneid.* vi. 21.

transforming the Minōtaur into a general or a powerful athlete, named Taurus, whom Thēseus vanquished in Krête.¹ But this altered version never overbore the old fanciful character of the tale as maintained by the poets. A great number of other religious ceremonies and customs, as well as several chapels or sacred enclosures in honour of different heroes, were connected with different acts and special ordinances of Thēseus. To every Athenian who took part in the festivals of the Oschophoria, the Pyanepsia, or the Kybernēsia, the name of this great hero was familiar; while the motives for offering to him solemn worship at his own special festival of the Thēseia, became evident and impressive.

The same Athenian legends which ennobled and decorated the character of Thēseus, painted in repulsive colours the attributes of Minōs; and the traits of the old Homeric comrade of Zeus were buried under those of the conqueror and oppressor of Athens. His history, like that of the other legendary personages of Greece, consists almost entirely of a string of family romances and tragedies. His son Katreus, father of Aëropē, wife of Atreus, was apprised by an oracle that he would perish by the hand of one of his own children: he accordingly sent them out of the island, and Althæmenēs, his son, established himself in Rhodes. Katreus having become old, and fancying that he had outlived the warning of the oracle, went over to Rhodes to see Althæmenēs. In an accidental dispute which arose between his attendants and the islanders, Althæmenēs inadvertently took part and slew his

¹ For the general narrative and its discrepancies, see Plutarch, Thēs. c. 15-19; Diodōr. iv. 60-62; Pausan. i. 17, 3; Ovid, Epist. Ariadn. Thēs. 104. In that other portion of the work of Diodōrus which relates more especially to Krête, and is borrowed from Krêtan logographers and historians (v. 64-80), he mentions nothing at all respecting the war of Minōs with Athens.

In the drama of Euripidēs called Thēseus, the genuine story of the youths and maidens about to be offered as food to the Minōtaur was introduced (Schol. ad Aristoph. Vesp. 312).

Ariadnē figures in the Odyssey along with Thēseus: she is the daughter of Minōs, carried off by Thēseus from Krête, and killed by Artemis in the way home: there is no allusion to Minōtaur, or tribute, or self-devotion of Thēseus (Odyss. xi. 324). This is probably the oldest and simplest form of the legend—one of the many amorous (compare Theognis, 1232) adventures of Thēseus: the rest is added by post-Homeric poets.

The respect of Aristotle for Minōs induces him to adopt the hypothesis that the Athenian youths and maidens were not put to death in Krête, but grew old in servitude. (Aristot. *Fragm. Βορριαλῶν Πολιτεία*, p. 106, ed. Neumann, of the Fragments of the treatise *Περὶ Πολιτειῶν*, Plutarch, Quæst. Græc. p. 298.)

father without knowing him. *Glaukus*, the youngest son of Minôs, pursuing a mouse, fell into a reservoir of honey and was drowned. No one knew what had become of him, and his father was inconsolable; at length the Argeian Polyeidus, a prophet wonderfully endowed by the gods, both discovered the boy and restored him to life, to the exceeding joy of Minôs.¹

The latter at last found his death in an eager attempt to overtake and punish Dædalus. This great artist, the eponymous hero of the Attic gens or dème called the Dædalidæ, and the descendant of Erechtheus through Mêtion, had been tried at the tribunal of Areiopagus and banished for killing his nephew Talos, whose rapidly improving skill excited his envy.² He took refuge in Krête, where he acquired the confidence of Minôs, and was employed (as has been already mentioned) in constructing the labyrinth; subsequently however he fell under the displeasure of Minôs, and was confined as a close prisoner in the inextricable windings of his own edifice. His unrivalled skill and resource however did not forsake him. He manufactured wings both for himself and for his son Ikarus, with which they flew over the sea. The father arrived safely in Sicily at Kamikus, the residence of the Sikanian king Kokalus; but the son, disdaining paternal example and admonition, flew so high that his wings were melted by the sun and he fell into the sea, which from him was called the Ikarian sea.³

Dædalus remained for some time in Sicily, leaving in various parts of the island many prodigious evidences of mechanical and architectural skill.⁴ At length Minôs, bent upon regaining possession of his person, undertook an expedition against Kokalus with a numerous fleet and army. Kokalus, affecting readiness to deliver up the fugitive, and receiving Minôs with apparent friendship, ordered a bath to be prepared for him by his three daughters, who, eager to protect Dædalus at any price, drowned the Krêtan king in the bath with hot water.⁵ Many

¹ Apollodôr. iii. cap. 2-3.

² Pherekyd. Fragm. 105; Hellanik. Fragm. 82 (Didot); Pausan. vii. 4, 5.

³ Diodôr. iv. 79; Ovid, Metamorph. viii. 181. Both Ephorus and Philistus mentioned the coming of Dædalus to Kokalus in Sicily (Ephor. Fr. 99; Philist. Fragm. 1, Didot); probably Antiochus noticed it also (Diodôr. xii. 71). Kokalus was the point of commencement for the Sicilian historians.

⁴ Diodôr. iv. 80.

⁵ Pausan. vii. 4, 5; Schol. Pindar. Nem. iv. 95; Hygin. fab. 44; Conon, Narr. 25; Ovid, Ibis, 291—

“*Vel tua matureret, sicut Minoia fata,
Per caput infusæ fervidus humor aquæ.*”

of the Krêtans who had accompanied him remained in Sicily and founded the town of Minoa, which they denominated after him. But not long afterwards Zeus instigated all the inhabitants of Krête (except the towns of Polichna and Præsus) to undertake with one accord an expedition against Kamikus for the purpose of avenging the death of Minôs. They besieged Kamikus in vain for five years, until at last famine compelled them to return. On their way along the coast of Italy, in the Gulf of Tarentum, a terrible storm destroyed their fleet and obliged them to settle permanently in the country: they founded Hyria with other cities, and became Messapian Iapygians. Other settlers, for the most part Greeks, immigrated into Krête to the spots which this movement had left vacant. In the second generation after Minôs, occurred the Trojan war. The departed Minôs was exceedingly offended with the Krêtans for co-operating in avenging the injury to Menelaus, since the Greeks generally had lent no aid to the Krêtans in their expedition against the town of Kamikus. He sent upon Krête, after the return of Idomeneus from Troy, such terrible visitations of famine and pestilence, that the population again died out or expatriated, and was again renovated by fresh immigrations. The intolerable suffering¹ thus brought upon the Krêtans by the anger of Minôs, for having co-operated in the general Grecian aid to Menelaus, was urged by them to the Greeks as the reason why they could take no part in resisting the invasion of Xerxês; and it is even pretended that they were advised and encouraged to adopt this ground of excuse by the Delphian oracle.²

Such is the Minôs of the poets and logographers, with his This story formed the subject of a lost drama of Sophoklês, Καμίκιοι or Μίνως; it was also told by Kallimachus, *Ἐν Αἴτιοι*, as well as by Philostephanus (Schol. Iliad. ii. 145).

¹ This curious and very characteristic narrative is given by Herodot. vii. 169-171.

² Herodot. vii. 169. The answer ascribed to the Delphian oracle, on the question being put by the Krêtan envoys whether it would be better for them to aid the Greeks against Xerxês or not, is highly emphatic and poetical: Ω νήπιοι, ἐπιμέμφεσθε δσα ὑμῖν ἐκ τῶν Μενελέω τιμωρμάτων Μίνως ἐπεμψε μηνιν δακρύματα, ὅτι οἱ μὲν οὐ ξυνεξερήξαντο αὐτῷ τὸν ἐν Καμίκῳ θάνατον γενόμενον, ὑμεῖς δὲ κείνοισι τὴν ἐκ Σπάρτης ἀρπαχθεῖσαν ὑπ' ἀνδρὸς Βαρβάρου γυναικα.

If such an answer was ever returned at all, I cannot but think that it must have been from some oracle in Krête itself, not from Delphi. The Delphian oracle could never have so far forgotten its obligations to the general cause of Greece, at that critical moment, which involved moreover the safety of all its own treasures, as to deter the Krêtans from giving assistance.

legendary and romantic attributes : the familiar comrade of the great Zeus,—the judge among the dead in Hadês,—the husband of Pasiphaê, daughter of the god Hêlios—the father of the goddess Ariadnê, as well as of Androgeos, who perishes and is worshipped at Athens,¹ and of the boy Glaukus, who is miraculously restored to life by a prophet,—the person beloved by Skylla, and the amorous pursuer of the nymph or goddess Britomartis,²—the proprietor of the Labyrinth and of the Minôtaur, and the exactor of a periodical tribute of youths and maidens from Athens as food for this monster,—lastly, the follower of the fugitive artist Dædalus to Kamikus, and the victim of the three ill-disposed daughters of Kokalûs in a bath. With this strongly-marked portrait, the Minôs of Thucydidês and Aristotle has scarcely anything in common except the name. He is the first to acquire *Thalassokraty*, or command of the Ægean sea : he expels the Karian inhabitants from the Cyclades islands, and sends thither fresh colonists under his own sons ; he puts down piracy, in order that he may receive his tribute regularly ; lastly, he attempts to conquer Sicily, but fails in the enterprise and perishes.³ Here we have conjectures, derived from the analogy of the Athenian maritime empire in the historical times, substituted in place of the fabulous incidents, and attached to the name of Minôs.

In the fable a tribute of seven youths and seven maidens is paid to him periodically by the Athenians ; in the historicised narrative this character of a tribute-collector is preserved, but the tribute is money collected from dependent islands ;⁴ and

¹ Hesiod. Theogon. 949 ; Pausan. i. I, 4.

² Kallimach. Hymn. ad Dian. 189. Strabo (x. p. 476) dwells also upon the strange contradiction of the legends concerning Minôs : I agree with Hoeckh (Kreta, ii. p. 93) that *δασμόλογος* in this passage refers to the tribute exacted from Athens for the Minôtaur.

³ Thucyd. i. 4. Μίνως γάρ, παλαιτάτος ὃν ἀκοῇ Ισμεν, ναυτικὸν ἐκτήσατο, καὶ τῆς υῦν Ελληνικῆς θαλάσσης ἐπὶ πλεῖστον ἐκράτησε, καὶ τῶν Κυκλαδῶν νήσων ἤρξε τε καὶ οἰκιστῆς αὐτὸς τῶν πλείστων ἐγένετο, Κάρας ἔξελάσας καὶ τούς ἑαυτοῦ παῖδας ἡγεμόνας ἐγκαταστήσας· τό τε ληστικὸν, ὡς εἰκὸς, καθῆρε ἐκ τῆς θαλάσσης, ἐφ' ὅσον ἡδύνατο, τοῦ τὰς προσόδους μᾶλλον ἴεναι αὐτῷ. See also c. 8.

Aristot. Polit. ii. 7, 2. Δοκεῖ δ' ἡ νῆσος καὶ πρὸς τὴν ἀρχὴν τὴν Ἑλληνικὴν πεφυκέναι καὶ κεῖσθαι καλῶς . . . διὸ καὶ τὴν τῆς θαλάσσης ἀρχὴν κατέσχεν δ' Μίνως, καὶ τὰς νήσους τὰς μὲν ἔχειρώσατο, τὰς δὲ φύκισε· τέλος δ' ἐπιθέμενος τὴν Σικελία τὸν βίον ἐτελεύτησεν ἐκεῖ περὶ Κάμικον.

Ephorus (ap. Skymn. Chi. 542) repeated the same statement : he mentioned also the indigenous king Krês.

⁴ It is curious that Herodotus expressly denies this, and in language which shows that he had made special inquiries about it : he says that the Karians or Leleges in the islands (who were, according to Thucydidês,

Aristotle points out to us how conveniently Krête is situated to exercise empire over the Ægean. The expedition against Kamikus, instead of being directed to the recovery of the fugitive Dædalus, is an attempt on the part of the great thalassokrat to conquer Sicily. Herodotus gives us generally the same view of the character of Minôs as a great maritime king, but his notice of the expedition against Kamikus includes the mention of Dædalus as the intended object of it.¹ Ephorus, while he described Minôs as a commanding and comprehensive lawgiver imposing his commands under the sanction of Zeus, represented him as the imitator of an earlier lawgiver named Rhadamanthus, and also as an immigrant into Krête from the Æolic Mount Ida, along with the priests or sacred companions of Zeus called the Idæi Dactyli. Aristotle too points him out as the author of the Syssitia, or public meals common in Krête as well as at Sparta,—other divergences in a new direction from the spirit of the old fables.²

The contradictory attributes ascribed to Minôs, together with the perplexities experienced by those who wished to introduce a regular chronological arrangement into these legendary events, has led both in ancient and in modern times to the supposition of two kings named Minôs, one the grandson of the other,—Minos I., the son of Zeus, lawgiver and judge,—Minos II., the thalassokrat,—a gratuitous conjecture, which, without solving the problem required, only adds one to the numerous artifices employed for imparting the semblance of history to the disparate matter of legend. The Krêtans were at all times, from Homer downward, expert and practised seamen. But that they were ever united under one government, or ever exercised maritime dominion in the Ægean is a fact which we are neither able to affirm nor to deny. The *Odyssey*,

expelled by Minôs) paid no tribute to Minôs, but manned his navy, *i. e.* they stood to Minôs much in the same relation as Chios and Lesbos stood to Athens (Herodot. i. 171). One may trace here the influence of those discussions which must have been prevalent at that time respecting the maritime empire of Athens.

¹ Herodot. vii. 170. Λέγεται γὰρ Μίνως κατὰ ζῆτησιν Δαιδάλου ἀπικόμενον ἐς Σικανίην, τὴν νῦν Σικελίην καλευμένην, ἀποθανεῖν βιαλφ θανάτῳ. Ἀνὰ δὲ χρόνον Κρήτας, θεοῦ σφι ἐποτρύναντος, &c.

² Aristot. Polit. ii. 7, 1; vii. 9, 2. Ephorus, Fragm. 63, 64, 65. He set aside altogether the Homeric genealogy of Minôs, which makes him brother of Rhadamanthus and born in Krête.

Strabo, in pointing out the many contradictions respecting Minôs, remarks, Ἐστι δὲ καὶ ἄλλος λόγος οὐχ διολογούμενος, τῶν μὲν ξένον τῆς νῆστου τὸν Μίνων λεγόντων, τῶν δὲ ἐπιχώριον. By the former he doubtless means Ephorus, though he has not here specified him (x. p. 477).

in so far as it justifies any inference at all, points against such a supposition, since it recognises a great diversity both of inhabitants and of languages in the island, and designates Minôs as king specially of Knôssus: it refutes still more positively the idea that Minôs put down piracy, which the Homeric Krêtans as well as others continue to practise without scruple.

Herodotus, though he in some places speaks of Minôs as a person historically cognisable, yet in one passage severs him pointedly from the generation of man. The Samian despot "Polykratês (he tells us) was the first person who aspired to nautical dominion, excepting Minôs of Knôssus, and others before him (if any such there ever were) who may have ruled the sea; but Polykratês is the first of that which is called *the generation of man* who aspired with much chance of success to govern Iônia and the islands of the Ægean."¹ Here we find it manifestly intimated that Minôs did not belong to the generation of man, and the tale given by the historian respecting the tremendous calamities which the wrath of the departed Minôs inflicted on Krête confirms the impression. The king of Knôssus is a god or a hero, but not a man; he belongs to legend, not to history. He is the son as well as the familiar companion of Zeus; he marries the daughter of Hélios, and Ariadnê is numbered among his offspring. To this super-human person are ascribed the oldest and most revered institutions of the island, religious and political, together with a period of supposed ante-historical dominion. That there is much of Krêtan religious ideas and practice embodied in the fables concerning Minôs can hardly be doubted; nor is it improbable that the tale of the youths and maidens sent from Athens may be based in some expiatory offerings rendered to a Krêtan divinity. The orgiastic worship of Zeus, solemnised by the armed priests with impassioned motions and violent excitement, was of ancient date in that island, as well as the connexion with the worship of Apollo both at Delphi and at Délos. To analyse the fables and to elicit from them any trustworthy particular facts, appears to me a fruitless attempt. The religious recollections, the romantic invention, and the

¹ Herodot. iii. 122. Πολυκράτης γάρ ἐστι πρώτος τῶν ἡμεῖς ἴδμεν Ἑλλήνων, ὃς θαλασσοκρατέιν ἐπενοήθη, παρέξ Μίνωος τε τοῦ Κυνωστίου, καὶ εἰ δή τις κἄλλος πρότερος τούτου ἦρε τῆς θαλάσσης· τῆς δὲ ἀνθρωπητῆς λεγομένης γενεῆς Πολυκράτης ἐστὶ πρώτος ἐλπίδας πολλὰς ἔχων Ἰωνίης τε καὶ νήσων ἄρξειν.

The expression exactly corresponds to that of Pausanias, ix. 5, 1, ἐπὶ τῶν καλουμένων Ἡρώων, for the age preceding the ἀνθρωπητή γενεή; also viii. 2, 1, ἐς τὰ ἀνωτέρω τοῦ ἀνθρώπων γένους.

items of matter of fact, if any such there be, must for ever remain indissolubly amalgamated as the poet originally blended them, for the amusement or edification of his auditors. Hoeckh, in his instructive and learned collection of facts respecting ancient Krête, construes the mythical genealogy of Minôs to denote a combination of the orgiastic worship of Zeus, indigenous among the Eteokrêtes, with the worship of the moon imported from Phœnicia, and signified by the names Europê, Pasiphaë and Ariadnê.¹ This is specious as a conjecture, but I do not venture to speak of it in terms of greater confidence.

From the connexion of religious worship and legendary tales between Krête and various parts of Asia Minor,—the Troad, the coast of Milêtus and Lykia, especially between Mount Ida in Krête, and Mount Ida in Æôlis,—it seems reasonable to infer an ethnographical kindred or relationship between the inhabitants anterior to the period of Hellenic occupation. The tales of Krêtan settlement at Minoa and Engyiôn on the south-western coast of Sicily, and in Iapygia on the Gulf of Tarentum, conduct us to a similar presumption, though the want of evidence forbids our tracing it farther. In the time of Herodotus, the Eteokrêtes, or aboriginal inhabitants of the island, were confined to Polichna and Præsus; but in earlier times, prior to the encroachments of the Hellênes, they had occupied the larger portion, if not the whole of the island. Minôs was originally their hero, subsequently adopted by the immigrant Hellênes,—at least Herodotus considers him as barbarian, not Hellenic.²

CHAPTER XIII

ARGONAUTIC EXPEDITION

THE ship Argô was the theme of many songs during the oldest periods of the Grecian epic, even earlier than the *Odyssey*. The king Æêtês, from whom she is departing, the hero Jasôn, who commands her, and the goddess Hérê, who watches over him, enabling the Argô to traverse distances and to escape dangers which no ship had ever before encountered,

¹ Hoeckh, *Kreta*, vol. ii. pp. 56–67. K. O. Müller also (Dorier. ii. 2, 14) puts a religious interpretation upon these Kreto-Attic legends, but he explains them in a manner totally different from Hoeckh.

² Herodot. i. 173.

are all circumstances briefly glanced at by Odysseus in his narrative to Alkinous. Moreover Eunêus, the son of Jasôn and Hypsipylê, governs Lêmnos during the siege of Troy by Agamemnôn, and carries on a friendly traffic with the Grecian camp, purchasing from them their Trojan prisoners.¹

The legend of Halus in Achaia Phthiotis, respecting the religious solemnities connected with the family of Athamas and Phryxus (related in a previous chapter) is also interwoven with the voyage of the Argôns; and both the legend and the solemnities seem evidently of great antiquity. We know further, that the adventures of the Argôns were narrated not only by Hesiod and in the Hesiodic poems, but also by Eumêlus and the author of the Naupaktian verses—by the latter seemingly at considerable length.² But these poems are unfortunately lost, nor have we any means of determining what the original story was; for the narrative, as we have it, borrowed from later sources, is enlarged by local tales from the subsequent Greek colonies—Kyzikus, Herakléia, Sinopê, and others.

Jasôn, commanded by Pelias to depart in quest of the golden fleece belonging to the speaking ram which had carried away Phryxus and Hellê, was encouraged by the oracle to

¹ Odyss. xii. 69—

Οἴη δὴ κείνη γε παρέπλει ποντόπορος νηῦς,
Ἄργῳ πασιμέλουσα, παρ' Αἰγάτῳ πλέουσα,
Καὶ νῦ κε την ἐνθ' ὅκα βάλεν μεγάλας ποτὶ πέρας,
Ἄλλα."Ηρη παρέπεμψεν, ἐπει φίλος ἦν Ἰήσων.

See also Iliad, vii. 470.

² See Hesiod, Fragm. Catalog. Fr. 6, p. 33, Dünz. ; *Eoiai*, Frag. 36, p. 39 ; Frag. 72, p. 47. Compare Schol. ad Apollôn. Rhod. i. 45 ; ii. 178-297, 1125 ; iv. 254-284. Other poetical sources—

The old epic poem *Ægimius*, Frag. 5, p. 57, Dünz.

Kinathôn in the *Herakléia* touched upon the death of Hylas near Kius in Mysia (Schol. Apollôn. Rhod. i. 1357).

The epic poem *Naupaktia*, Frag. 1 to 6, Dünz. p. 61.

Eumêlus, Frag. 2, 3, 5, p. 65, Dünz.

Epimenidês, the Krêtan prophet and poet, composed a poem in 6500 lines, 'Αργοῦς ναυπηγίαν τε, καὶ Ιάσονος εἰς Κόλχους ἀποπλοῦν (Diogen. Laér. i. 10, 5), which is noticed more than once in the Scholia on Apollônias, on subjects connected with the poem (ii. 1125 ; iii. 42). See Mimnerm. Frag. 10, Schneidewin, p. 15.

Antimachus, in his poem *Lydê*, touched upon the Argonautic expedition, and has been partially copied by Apollônias Rhod. (Schol. Ap. Rh. i. 1290 ; ii. 296 ; iii. 410 ; iv. 1153).

The logographers Pherekydês and Hekataeus seem to have related the expedition at considerable length.

The Bibliothek der alten Literatur und Kunst (Göttingen, 1786, 2nd Stück, p. 61) contains an instructive Dissertation by Groddeck, Ueber die Argonautika, a summary of the various authorities respecting this expedition.

invite the noblest youth of Greece to his aid, and fifty of the most distinguished amongst them obeyed the call. Héraklès, Théseus, Telamôn and Pélæus, Kastôr and Pollux, Idas and Lynkeus—Zêtês and Kalaïs, the winged sons of Boreas—Meleager, Amphiaraus, Képheus, Laertês, Autolykus, Mencætius, Aktor, Erginus, Euphémus, Ankæus, Pœas, Periklymenus, Augeas, Eurytus, Admêtus, Akastus, Kæneus, Euryalus, Pêneleôs and Léitus, Askalaphus and Ialmenus, were among them. Argus the son of Phryxus, directed by the promptings of Athénê, built the ship, inserting in the prow a piece of timber, from the celebrated oak of Dodona, which was endued with the faculty of speech :¹ Tiphys was the steersman, Idmôn (the son of Apollo) and Mopsus accompanied them as prophets, while Orpheus came to amuse their weariness, and reconcile their quarrels, with his harp.²

¹ Apollôn. Rhod. i. 525; iv. 580. Apollodôr. i. 9, 16. Valerius Flaccus (i. 300) softens down the speech of the ship Argô into a dream of Jasôñ. Alexander Polyhistor explained what wood was used (Tlin. H. N. xiii. 22).

² Apollônius Rhodius, Apollodôrus, Valerius Flaccus, the Orphic Argonauta, and Hyginus, have all given Catalogues of the Argonautic heroes (there was one also in the lost tragedy called *Δῆμυαι* of Sophoklês, see Welcker, Gr. Trag. i. 327): the discrepancies among them are numerous and irreconcileable. Burmann, in the Catalogus Argonautarum, prefixed to his edition of Valerius Flaccus, has discussed them copiously. I transcribe one or two of the remarks of this conscientious and laborious critic, out of many of a similar tenor, on the impracticability of a fabulous chronology. Immediately before the first article, *Acastus*—“Neque enim in ætibus Argonautarum ullam rationem temporum constare, neque in stirpe et stemmate deducendâ ordinem ipsum naturæ congruere videbam. Nam et huic militiae adscribi videbam Heroas, qui per naturæ leges et ordinem fati eo usque vitam extrahere non potuere, ut aliis ab hac expeditione remotis Heroum militis nomina dedisse narrari deberent a Poetis et Mythologis. In idem etiam tempus avos et nepotes conjici, consanguineos ætate longe inferiores prioribus ut æquales adjungi, concoquere vix posse videtur.”—Art. *Ancæus*: “Scio objici posse, si seriem illam majorem respiciamus, hunc Ancæum simul cum proavo suo Talao in eandem profectum fuisse expeditionem. Sed similia exempla in aliis occurrit, et in fabulis rationem temporum non semper accuratam licet deducere.”—Art. *Jasôñ*: “Herculi enim jam proiectâ ætate adhaesit Theseus juvenis, et in Amazoniâ expeditione socius fuit, interfuit huic expeditioni, venatui apri Calydonii, et rapuit Helenam, quæ circa Trojanum bellum maxime floruit: quæ omnia si Theseus tot temporum intervallis distincta egit, secula duo vel tria vixisse debuit. Certe Jason Hypsipylem neptem Ariadnes, nec videre, nec Lemni cognoscere potuit.”—Art. *Meleager*: “Unum est quod alicui longum ordinem majorum recensenti scrupulum movere possit: nimis longum intervallum inter Æolum et Meleagrum intercedere, ut potuerit interfuisse huic expeditioni: cum nonus fere numeretur ab Æolo, et plurimi ut Jason, Argus, et alii tertiâ tantum ab Æolo generatione distent. Sed sæpe jam notavimus, frustra temporum concordiam in fabulis quæri.”

First they touched at the island of Lémnos, in which at that time there were no men : for the women, infuriated by jealousy and ill-treatment, had put to death their fathers, husbands, and brothers. The Argonauts, after some difficulty, were received with friendship, and even admitted into the greatest intimacy. They staid some months, and the subsequent population of the island was the fruit of their visit. Hypsipylê, the queen of the island, bore to Jasôn two sons.¹

They then proceeded onward along the coast of Thrace, up the Hellespont, to the southern coast of the Propontis, inhabited by the Doliones and their king Kyzikus. Here they were kindly entertained, but after their departure were driven back to the same spot by a storm ; and as they landed in the dark, the inhabitants did not know them. A battle took place, in which the chief, Kyzikus, was killed by Jasôn ; whereby much grief was occasioned as soon as the real facts became known. After Kyzikus had been interred with every demonstration of mourning and solemnity, the Argonauts proceeded along the coast of Mysia.² In this part of the voyage, they left Héraklês behind. For Hylas, his favourite youthful companion, had been stolen away by the nymphs of a fountain, and Héraklês, wandering about in search of him, neglected to return. At last he sorrowfully retired, exacting hostages from the inhabitants of the neighbouring town of Kius that they would persist in the search.³

Read also the articles *Castôr and Pollux*, *Nestôr*, *Péleus*, *Staphylus*, &c.

We may stand excused for keeping clear of a chronology which is fertile only in difficulties, and ends in nothing but illusions.

¹ Apollodôr. i. 9, 17 ; Apollôn. Rhod. i. 609-915 ; Herodot. iv. 145. Theokritus (Idyll. xiii. 29) omits all mention of Lémnos, and represents the Argô as arriving on the third day from Iôlkos at the Hellespont. Diodôrus (iv. 41) also leaves out Lémnos.

² Apollôn. Rhod. 940-1020 ; Apollodôr. i. 9, 18.

³ Apollodôr. i. 9, 19. This was the religious legend, explanatory of a ceremony performed for many centuries by the people of Prusa : they ran round the lake Askanius shouting and clamouring for Hylas—“ut litus Hyla, Hyla omne sonaret.” (Virgil, Eclog.) “in cuius memoriam adhuc solemni cursatione lacum populus circuit et Hylam voce clamat.” Solinus, c. 42.

There is endless discrepancy as to the concern of Héraklês with the Argonautic expedition. A story is alluded to in Aristotle (Politic. iii. 9) that the ship Argô herself refused to take him on board, because he was so much superior in stature and power to all the other heroes—οὐ γὰρ ἔθέλειν αὐτὸν ἄγειν τὴν Ἀργώ μερὰ τῶν ἀλλων, ὡς ὑπερβάλλοντα πολὺ τῶν πλωτήρων. This was the story of Pherekydês (Fr. 67, Didot) as well as of Antimachus (Schol. Apoll. Rhod. i. 1290) : it is probably a very ancient portion of the legend, inasmuch as it ascribes to the ship sentient powers,

They next stopped in the country of the Bebrykians, where the boxing contest took place between the king Amykus and the Argonaut Pollux:¹ they then proceeded onward to Bithynia, the residence of the blind prophet Phineus. His blindness had been inflicted by Poseidôn as a punishment for having communicated to Phryxus the way to Kolchis. The choice had been allowed to him between death and blindness, and he had preferred the latter.² He was also tormented by the harpies, winged monsters who came down from the clouds whenever his table was set, snatched the food from his lips and imparted to it a foul and unapproachable odour. In the midst of this misery, he hailed the Argonauts as his deliverers—his prophetic powers having enabled him to foresee their coming. The meal being prepared for him, the harpies approached as usual, but Zêtês and Kalais, the winged sons of Boreas, drove them away and pursued them. They put forth all their speed, and prayed to Zeus to be enabled to overtake the monsters; when Hermès appeared and directed them to desist, the harpies being forbidden further to molest Phineus,³ and retiring again to their native cavern in Krête.⁴

Phineus, grateful for the relief afforded to him by the Argonauts, forewarned them of the dangers of their voyage and of the precautions necessary for their safety; and through his suggestions they were enabled to pass through the terrific rocks called Symplêgades. These were two rocks which alternately opened and shut, with a swift and violent collision, so that it

in consonance with her other miraculous properties. The etymology of Aphetæ in Thessaly was connected with the tale of Héraklês having there been put on shore from the Argô (Herodot. vii. 193): Ephorus said that he staid away voluntarily from fondness for Omphalê (Frag. 9, Didot). The old epic poet Kinæthôn said that Héraklês had placed the Kian hostages at Trachin, and that the Kians ever afterwards maintained a respectful correspondence with that place (Schol. Ap. Rh. i. 1357). This is the explanatory legend connected with some existing custom, which we are unable further to unravel.

¹ See above, chap. viii.

² Such was the old narrative of the Hesiodic Catalogue and Eoiai. See Schol. Apollôn. Rhod. ii. 181–296.

³ This again was the old Hesiodic story (Schol. Apoll. Rhod. ii. 296)—

**Ἐνθ' οὕτις εὐχεσθοντος Αἰνητῷ οὐψιμέδοντι.*

Apollodôrus (i. 9, 21), Apollônius (178–300), and Valerius Flacc. (iv. 428–530) agree in most of the circumstances.

⁴ Such was the fate of the harpies as given in the old Naupaktian Verses. (See Fragm. Ep. Græc. Dünzter, Naupakt. Fr. 2, p. 61.)

The adventure of the Argonauts with Phineus is given by Diodôrus in a manner totally different (Diodôr. iv. 44): he seems to follow Dionysius of Mitylénê (see Schol. Apollôn. Rhod. ii. 207).

was difficult even for a bird to fly through during the short interval. When the Argô arrived at the dangerous spot, Euphémus let loose a dove, which flew through and just escaped with the loss of a few feathers of her tail. This was a signal to the Argonauts, according to the prediction of Phineus, that they might attempt the passage with confidence. Accordingly they rowed with all their might, and passed safely through : the closing rocks, held for a moment asunder by the powerful arms of Athénê, just crushed the ornaments at the stern of their vessel. It had been decreed by the gods, that so soon as any ship once got through, the passage should for ever afterwards be safe and easy to all. The rocks became fixed in their separate places, and never again closed.¹

After again halting on the coast of the Mariandynians, where their steersman Tiphys died, as well as in the country of the Amazons, and after picking up the sons of Phryxus, who had been cast away by Poseidôn in their attempt to return from Kolchis to Greece, they arrived in safety at the river Phasis and the residence of Æêtê. In passing by Mount Caucasus, they saw the eagle which gnawed the liver of Prométheus nailed to the rock, and heard the groans of the sufferer himself. The sons of Phryxus were cordially welcomed by their mother Chalkiopê.² Application was made to Æêtê, that he would grant to the Argonauts, heroes of divine parentage and sent forth by the mandate of the gods, possession of the golden fleece : their aid in return was proffered to him against any or all of his enemies. But the king was wroth, and peremptorily refused, except upon conditions which seemed impracticable.³ Héphaestos had given him two ferocious and untameable bulls, with brazen feet, which breathed fire from their nostrils : Jasôn was invited, as a proof both of his illustrious descent and of the sanction of the gods to his voyage, to harness these animals to the yoke, so as to plough a large field and sow it with dragon's teeth.⁴ Perilous as the condition was, each one of the heroes volunteered to make the attempt. Idmôn especially encouraged Jasôn to undertake it,⁵ and the goddesses Hêrê and Aphrodítê made straight the way for him.⁶ Mêdea, the daughter of Æêtê and Eidyia, having

¹ Apollodôr. i. 9, 22. Apollôn. Rhod. ii. 310-615.

² Apollodôr. i. 9, 23. Apollôn. Rhod. ii. 850-1257.

³ Apollôn. Rhod. iii. 320-385.

⁴ Apollôn. Rhod. iii. 410. Apollodôr. i. 9, 23.

⁵ This was the story of the Naupaktian Verses (Schol. Apollôn. Rhod. iii. 515-525) : Apollônius and others altered it. Idmôn, according to them, died in the voyage before the arrival at Kolchis.

⁶ Apollôn. Rhod. iii. 50-200. Valer. Flacc. vi. 440-480. Hygin. fab. 22.

seen the youthful hero in his interview with her father, had conceived towards him a passion which disposed her to employ every means for his salvation and success. She had received from Hekatê pre-eminent magical powers, and she prepared for Jasôn the powerful Prometheian unguent, extracted from a herb which had grown where the blood of Prométheus dropped. The body of Jasôn having been thus pre-medicated, became invulnerable¹ either by fire or by warlike weapons. He undertook the enterprise, yoked the bulls without suffering injury, and ploughed the field: when he had sown the dragon's teeth, armed men sprung out of the furrows. But he had been forewarned by Mêdea to cast a vast rock into the midst of them, upon which they began to fight with each other, so that he was easily enabled to subdue them all.²

The task prescribed had thus been triumphantly performed. Yet Æêtêš not only refused to hand over the golden fleece, but even took measures for secretly destroying the Argonauts and burning their vessel. He designed to murder them during the night after a festal banquet; but Aphroditê, watchful for the safety of Jasôn,³ inspired the Kolchian king at the critical moment with an irresistible inclination for his nuptial bed. While he slept, the wise Idmôn counselled the Argonauts to make their escape, and Mêdea agreed to accompany them.⁴ She lulled to sleep by a magic potion the dragon who guarded the golden fleece, placed that much-desired prize on board the vessel, and accompanied Jasôn with his companions in their flight, carrying along with her the young Apsyrtus, her brother.⁵

Æêtêš, profoundly exasperated at the flight of the Argonauts with his daughter, assembled his forces forthwith, and put to sea in pursuit of them. So energetic were his efforts that he shortly overtook the retreating vessel, when the Argonauts again owed their safety to the stratagem of Mêdea. She killed her brother Apsyrtus, cut his body in pieces and strewed the limbs round about in the sea. Æêtêš on reaching the spot found

¹ Apollôn. Rhod. iii. 835. Apollodôr. i. 9, 23. Valer. Flacc. vii. 356. Ovid, Epist. xii. 15—

“*Isset anhelatos non præmedicatus in ignes
Immemor Æsonides, oraque adunca boum.*”

² Apollôn. Rhod. iii. 1230-1400.

³ The Naupaktian Verses stated this (see the Fragm. 6, ed. Dûntzer, p. 61), ap. Schol. Apollôn. Rhod. iv. 59-86.

⁴ Such was the story of the Naupaktian Verses. (See Fragm. 6, p. 61. Dûntzer ap. Schol. Apollôn. Rhod. iv. 59, 86, 87.)

⁵ Apollodôr. i. 9, 23. Apollôn. Rhod. iv. 220.

Pherekydês said that Jasôn killed the dragon (Fr. 74, Did.).

these sorrowful traces of his murdered son ; but while he tarried to collect the scattered fragments, and bestow upon the body an honourable interment, the Argonauts escaped.¹ The spot on which the unfortunate Apsyrtus was cut up received the name of Tomi.² This fratricide of Mēdeia, however, so deeply provoked the indignation of Zeus, that he condemned the Argō and her crew to a trying voyage, full of hardship and privation, before she was permitted to reach home. The returning heroes traversed an immeasurable length both of sea and of river : first up the river Phasis into the ocean which flows round the earth —then following the course of that circumfluous stream until its junction with the Nile,³ they came down the Nile into Egypt, from whence they carried the Argō on their shoulders by a fatiguing land-journey to the lake Tritōnis in Libya. Here they were rescued from the extremity of want and exhaustion by the

¹ This is the story of Apollodōrus (i. 9, 24), who seems to follow Pherekydēs (Fr. 73, Didot). Apollōnus (iv. 225–480) and Valerius Flaccus (viii. 262 *seq.*) give totally different circumstances respecting the death of Apsyrtus : but the narrative of Pherekydēs seems the oldest : so revolting a story as that of the cutting up of the little boy cannot have been imagined in later times.

Sophoklēs composed two tragedies on the adventures of Jasōn and Mēdeia, both lost—the Κολχίδες, and the Σκύθαι. In the former he represented the murder of the child Apsyrtus as having taken place in the house of Aētēs : in the latter he introduced the mitigating circumstance, that Apsyrtus was the son of Aētēs by a different mother from Mēdeia (Schol. Apollōn. Rhod. iv. 223).

² Apollodōr. i. 9, 24, τον τόπον προσηγόρευσε Τόμους. Ovid, Trist. iii. 9. The story that Apsyrtus was cut in pieces, is the etymological legend explanatory of the name Tomi.

There was however a place called Apsarus, on the southern coast of the Euxine, west of Trapezus, where the tomb of Apsyrtus was shown, and where it was affirmed that he had been put to death. He was the eponymus of the town, which was said to have been once called Apsyrtus, and only corrupted by a barbarian pronunciation. (Arrian, Periplus, Euxin. p. 6 ; Geogr. Min. v. 1.) Compare Procop. Bell. Goth. iv. 2.

Strabo connects the death of Apsyrtus with the Apsyrtides, islands off the coast of Illyria, in the Adriatic (vii. p. 315).

³ The original narrative was, that the Argō returned by navigating the circumfluous ocean. This would be almost certain, even without positive testimony, from the early ideas entertained by the Greeks respecting geography ; but we know further that it was the representation of the Hesiodic poems, as well as of Mimmermus, Hekatēus and Pindar, and even of Antimachus. Schol. Parisin. Ap. Rhod. iv. 254. Ἐκαταῖος δὲ διαλήσιος διὰ τοῦ Φάσιδος ἀνελθεῖν φησὶν αὐτὸν εἰς τὸν Ὀκεανὸν διὰ δὲ τοῦ Οκεανοῦ κατελθεῖν εἰς τὸν Νεῖλον. ἐκ δὲ τοῦ Νεῖλου εἰς τὴν καθ' ἡμᾶς θάλασσαν. Ησίοδος δὲ καὶ Πίνδαρος ἐν Πιθιούλαις καὶ Ἀντίμαχος ἐν Λιδῇ διὰ τοῦ Οκεανοῦ φασὶν ἀλλεῖν αὐτὸν εἰς τὴν Λιβύην. εἰτα βαστάσαντας τὴν Ἀργῷ εἰς τὸ ἡμέτερον ἀφικέσθαι πέλαγος. Compare the Schol. Edit. ad iv. 259.

kindness of the local god Tritôn, who treated them hospitably, and even presented to Euphêmus a clod of earth, as a symbolical promise that his descendants should one day found a city on the Libyan shore. The promise was amply redeemed by the flourishing and powerful city of Kyrêné,¹ whose princes the Battiadæ boasted themselves as lineal descendants of Euphêmus.

Refreshed by the hospitality of Tritôn, the Argonauts found themselves again on the waters of the Mediterranean in their way homeward. But before they arrived at Iôlkos they visited Circê, at the island of Ææa, where Mêdea was purified for the murder of Apsyrtus: they also stopped at Korkyra, then called Drepanê, where Alkinous received and protected them. The cave in that island where the marriage of Mêdea with Jasôn was consummated, was still shown in the time of the historian Timæus, as well as the altars to Apollo which she had erected, and the rites and sacrifices which she had first instituted.² After leaving Korkyra, the Argô was overtaken by a perilous storm near the island of Thêra. The heroes were saved from imminent peril by the supernatural aid of Apollo, who, shooting from his golden bow an arrow which pierced the waves like a track of light, caused a new island suddenly to spring up in their track and present to them a port of refuge. The island was called Anaphê; and the grateful Argonauts established upon it an altar and sacrifices in honour of Apollo Aëglêtæ, which were ever afterwards continued, and traced back by the inhabitants to this originating adventure.³

On approaching the coast of Krête, the Argonauts were prevented from landing by Talôs, a man of brass, fabricated by Hêphæstos, and presented by him to Minôs for the protection of the island.⁴ This vigilant sentinel hurled against the approaching vessel fragments of rock, and menaced the heroes with destruction. But Mêdea deceived him by a stratagem and

¹ See the fourth Pythian ode of Pindar, and Apollôn. Rhod. iv. 1551-1756.

The tripod of Jasôn was preserved by the Euesperitæ in Libya, Diod. iv. 56: but the legend connecting the Argonauts with the lake Tritônis in Libya, is given with some considerable differences in Herodotus, iv. 179.

² Apollôn. Rhod. iv. 1153-1217. Timæus, Fr. 7-8, Didot. Τίμαιος ἐν Κερκύρᾳ λέγων γενέσθαι τοὺς γάμους, καὶ περὶ τῆς θυσίας ιστορεῖ, ὅτι καὶ νῦν λέγων ἔγεσθαι αὐτὴν κατ' ἐνιαυτὸν, Μηδείας πρώτον θυσάστης ἐν τῷ τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος ιερῷ. Καὶ θωμός δέ φησι μημεῖα τῶν γάμων ἰδρύσασθαι σύνεγγυς μὲν τῆς θαλάσσης, οὐ μακρὰν δὲ τῆς πόλεως. Ὄνομάζουσι δὲ τὸν μὲν Νυμφῶν τὸν δὲ Νηρῆιδῶν.

³ Apollodôr. i. 9, 25. Apollôn. Rhod. iv. 1700-1725.

⁴ Some called Talôs a remnant of the brazen race of men (Schol. Apoll. Rhod. iv. 1641).

killed him; detecting and assailing the one vulnerable point in his body. The Argonauts were thus enabled to land and refresh themselves. They next proceeded onward to Ægina, where however they again experienced resistance before they could obtain water—then along the coast of Eubœa and Lokris back to Iôlkos in the gulf of Pagasæ, the place from whence they had started. The proceedings of Pelias during their absence, and the signal revenge taken upon him by Mêdea after their return, have already been narrated in a preceding section.¹ The ship Argô herself, in which the chosen heroes of Greece had performed so long a voyage and braved so many dangers, was consecrated by Jasôn to Poseidôn at the isthmus of Corinth. According to another account, she was translated to the stars by Athênê, and became a constellation.²

Traces of the presence of the Argonauts were found not only in the regions which lay between Iôlkos and Kolchis, but also in the western portion of the Grecian world—distributed more or less over all the spots visited by Grecian mariners or settled by Grecian colonists, and scarcely less numerous than the wanderings of the dispersed Greeks and Trojans after the capture of Troy. The number of Jasonia, or temples for the heroic worship of Jasôn, was very great, from Abdêra in Thrace,³ eastward along the coast of the Euxine, to Armenia and Media. The Argonauts had left their anchoring-stone on the coast of Bebrykia, near Kyzikus, and there it was preserved during the historical ages in the temple of the Jasonian Athênê.⁴ They had founded the great temple of the Idæan mother on the mountain Dindymon, near Kyzikus, and the Hieron of Zeus Urios on the Asiatic point at the mouth of the Euxine, near which was also the harbour of Phryxus.⁵ Idmôn, the prophet of the expedition, who was believed to have died of a wound by a wild boar on

¹ Apollodôr. i. 9, 26. Apollôn. Rhod. iv. 1638.

² Diodôr. iv. 53. Erastoth. Catasterism. c. 35.

³ Strabo, xi. p. 526-531.

⁴ Apollôn. Rhod. i. 955-960, and the Scholia.

There was in Kyzikus a temple of Apollo under different ἐπικλήσεις; some called it the temple of the Jasonian Apollo.

Another anchor however was preserved in the temple of Rhea on the banks of the Phasis, which was affirmed to be the anchor of the ship Argô. Arrian saw it there, but seems to have doubted its authenticity (Periplus, Euxin. Pont. p. 9. Geogr. Min. v. 1).

⁵ Neanthês ap. Strabo. i. p. 45. Apollôn. Rhod. i. 1125, and Schol. Steph. Byz. v. Φρύξος.

Apollônius mentions the fountain called Jasoneæ, on the hill of Dindymon. Apollôn. Rhod. ii. 532, and the citations from Timosthenês and Herodôrus in the Scholia. See also Appian, Syriac, c. 63.

the Mariandynian coast, was worshipped by the inhabitants of the Pontic Hérakleia with great solemnity, as their Heros Poliuchus, and that too by the special direction of the Delphian god. Autolykus, another companion of Jasōn, was worshipped as Ēkist by the inhabitants of Sinopē. Moreover, the historians of Hérakleia pointed out a temple of Hekatē in the neighbouring country of Paphlagonia, first erected by Mēdea;¹ and the important town of Pantikapæon, on the European side of the Cimmerian Bosporus, ascribed its first settlement to a son of Æêtēs.² When the returning ten thousand Greeks sailed along the coast, called the Jasonian shore, from Sinopē to Hérakleia, they were told that the grandson of Æêtēs was reigning king of the territory at the mouth of the Phasis, and the anchoring-places where the Argō had stopped were specially pointed out to them.³ In the lofty regions of the Moschi, near Kolchis, stood the temple of Leukothea, founded by Phryxus, which remained both rich and respected down to the times of the kings of Pontus, and where it was an inviolable rule not to offer up a ram.⁴ The town of Dioskuriās, north of the river Phasis, was believed to have been hallowed by the presence of Kastōr and Pollux in the Argō, and to have received from them its appellation.⁵ Even the interior of Media and Armenia was full of memorials of Jasōn and Mēdea, and their son Mēdus, or of Armenus the son of Jasōn, from whom the Greeks deduced not only the name and foundation of the Medes and Armenians, but also the great operation of cutting a channel through the mountains for the efflux of the river Araxes, which they compared to that of the Peneius in Thessaly.⁶ And the Roman

¹ See the historians of Hérakleia, Nymphis and Promathidas, *Fragn.* Orelli, pp. 99, 100-104. *Schol. ad Apollōn. Rhod.* iv. 247. *Strabo*, xii. p. 546. Autolykus, whom he calls companion of Jasōn, was, according to another legend, comrade of Héraklēs in his expedition against the Amazons.

² Stephan. *Byz.* v. Παντικαπαῖον, *Eustath. ad Dionys. Perieget.* 311.

³ Xenophōn, *Anabas.* vi. 2, 1; v. 7, 37.

⁴ *Strabo*, xi. p. 499.

⁵ *Appian, Mithridatic.* c. 101.

⁶ *Strabo*, xi. p. 499, 503, 526, 531; i. p. 45-48. *Justin, xlvi. 3*, whose statements illustrate the way in which men found a present home and application for the old fables,—“Jason, primus humanorum post Herculem et Liberum, qui reges Orientis fuisse traduntur, eam coeli plagam domuisse dicitur. Cum Albanis fedus percussit, qui Herculem ex Italâ ab Albano monte, cum, Geryone extincto, armenta ejus per Italiam duceret, secuti dicuntur; quique, memores Italicæ originis, exercitum Cn. Pompeii bello Mithridatico fratres consulatuvâre. Itaque Jasoni totus fere Oriens, ut conditor, divinos honores templa constituit; quæ Parmenio, dux Alexandri Magni, post multos annos dirui jussit, ne cujusquam nomen in Oriente venerabilius quam Alexandri esset.”

general Pompey, after having completed the conquest and expulsion of Mithridatēs, made long marches through Kolchis into the regions of Caucasus, for the express purpose of contemplating the spots which had been ennobled by the exploits of the Argonauts, the Dioskuri and Hēraklēs.¹

In the west, memorials either of the Argonauts or of the pursuing Kolchians were pointed out in Korkyra, in Krête, in Epirus near the Akrokerauian mountains, in the islands called Apsyrtides near the Illyrian coast, at the bay of Caieta as well as at Poseidōnia on the southern coast of Italy, in the island of Æthalia or Elba, and in Libya.²

Such is a brief outline of the Argonautic expedition, one of the most celebrated and widely-diffused among the ancient tales of Greece. Since so many able men have treated it as an undisputed reality, and even made it the pivot of systematic chronological calculations, I may here repeat the opinion long ago expressed by Heyne, and even indicated by Burmann, that the process of dissecting the story in search of a basis of fact, is one altogether fruitless.³ Not only are we unable to assign

The Thessalian companions of Alexander the Great, placed by his victories in possession of rich acquisitions in these regions, pleased themselves by vivifying and multiplying all these old fables, proving an ancient kindred between the Medes and Thessalians. See Strabo, xi. p. 530. The temples of Jasōn were *τιμώμενα σφρόδρα ὑπὸ τῶν θεοφόρων* (ib. p. 526).

The able and inquisitive geographer Eratosthenēs was among those who fully believed that Jasōn had left his ships in the Phasis, and had undertaken a land expedition into the interior country, in which he had conquered Media and Armenia (Strabo, i. p. 48).

¹ Appian, Mithridatic. 103: *τοὺς Κόλχους ἐπήει, καθ' ιστορίαν τῆς Ἀργοναυτῶν καὶ Διοσκούρων καὶ Ἡρακλέους ἐπιδημίας, καὶ μάλιστα τὸ πάθος οὗτον ἐθέλων, ὃ Προμηθεῖ φασὶ γενέσθαι περὶ τὸ Καύκασον ὄρος.* The lofty crag of Caucasus called Strobilus, to which Prométheus had been attached, was pointed out to Arrian himself in his *Periplus* (p. 12, Geogr. Minor. vol. i.).

² Strabo, i. pp. 21, 45, 46; v. 224-252. Pompon. Mel. ii. 3. Diodōr. iv. 56. Apollōn. Rhod. iv. 656. Lycophron, 1273—

*Τύρου μακεδνᾶς ἀμφὶ Κιρκαίου νάπας
Ἀργούς τε κλεινὸν ὄρμον Αἰγάτην μέγαν.*

³ Heyne, Observ. ad Apollodōr. i. 9, 16. p. 72. “Mirum in modum fallitur, qui in his commentis certum fundum historicum vel geographicum aut exquirere studet, aut se reperisse, atque historicam vel geographicam aliquam doctrinam, systema nos dicimus, inde procudi posse, putat,” &c.

See also the observations interspersed in Burmann's Catalogus Argonautarum, prefixed to his edition of Valerius Flaccus.

The Persian antiquarians whom Herodotus cites at the beginning of his history (i. 2-4—it is much to be regretted that Herodotus did not inform us who they were, and whether they were the same as those who said that Perseus was an Assyrian by birth, and had become a Greek, vi. 54), joined together the abductions of Iō and of Eurōpē, of Mēdea and of

the date, or identify the crew, or decipher the log-book, of the Argô, but we have no means of settling even the preliminary question, whether the voyage be matter of fact badly reported, or legend from the beginning. The widely-distant spots in which the monuments of the voyage were shown, no less than the incidents of the voyage itself, suggest no other parentage than epical fancy. The supernatural and the romantic not only constitute an inseparable portion of the narrative, but even embrace all the prominent and characteristic features ; if they do not comprise the whole, and if there be intermingled along with them any sprinkling of historical or geographical fact,—a question to us indeterminable,—there is at least no solvent by which it can be disengaged, and no test by which it can be recognised. Wherever the Grecian mariner sailed, he carried his religious and patriotic mythes along with him. His fancy and his faith were alike full of the long wanderings of Jasôn, Odysseus, Perseus, Héraklês, Dionysus, Triptolemus or Iô ; it was pleasing to him in success, and consoling to him in difficulty, to believe that their journeys had brought them over the ground which he was himself traversing. There was no tale amidst the wide range of the Grecian epic more calculated to be popular with the seaman, than the history of the primæval ship Argô, and her distinguished crew, comprising heroes from all parts of Greece, and especially the Tyndarids Kastôr and Pollux, the heavenly protectors invoked during storm and peril. He localised the legend anew wherever he went, often with some fresh circumstances suggested either by his own adventures or by the scene before him. He took a sort of religious possession of the spot, connecting it by a bond of faith with his native land, and erecting in it a temple or an altar with appropriate commemorative solemnities. The Jasonium thus established, and indeed every visible object called after the name of the hero, not only served to keep alive the legend of the Argô in the minds of future comers or inhabitants, but was accepted as an obvious and satisfactory proof that this marvellous vessel had actually touched there in her voyage.

Helen, as pairs of connected proceedings, the second injury being a retaliation for the first,—they drew up a debtor and creditor account of abductions between Asia and Europe. The Kolchian king (they said) had sent a herald to Greece to ask for his satisfaction for the wrong done to him by Jasôn and to re-demand his daughter Mêdea ; but he was told in reply that the Greeks had received no satisfaction for the previous rape of Iô.

There was some ingenuity in thus binding together the old fables, so as to represent the invasions of Greece by Darius and Xerxês as retaliations for the unexpiated destruction wrought by Agamemnôn.

The epic poets, building both on the general love of fabulous incident and on the easy faith of the people, dealt with distant and unknown space in the same manner as with past and unrecorded time. They created a mythical geography for the former, and a mythical history for the latter. But there was this material difference between the two: that while the unrecorded time was beyond the reach of verification, the unknown space gradually became trodden and examined. In proportion as authentic local knowledge was enlarged, it became necessary to modify the geography, or shift the scene of action, of the old mythes; and this perplexing problem was undertaken by some of the ablest historians and geographers of antiquity,—for it was painful to them to abandon any portion of the old epic, as if it were destitute of an ascertainable basis of truth.

Many of these fabulous localities are to be found in Homer and Hesiod, and the other Greek poets and logographers,—Erytheia, the garden of the Hesperides, the garden of Phœbus,¹ to which Boreas transported the Attic maiden Orithyia, the delicious country of the Hyperboreans, the Elysian plain,² the floating island of Æolus, Thrinakia, the country of the Æthiopians, the Læstrygones, the Kyklôpes, the Lotophagi, the Sirens, the Cimmerians and the Gorgons,³ &c. These are places which (to use the expression of Pindar respecting the Hyperboreans) you cannot approach either by sea or by land:⁴ the wings of the poet alone can carry you thither. They were not introduced into the Greek mind by incorrect geographical reports, but, on the contrary, had their origin in the legend, and passed from thence into the realities of geography,⁵ which

¹ Sophokl. ap. Strabo. vii. p. 295—

Τούπερ τε πόντον πάγτ' ἐπ' ἔσχατα χθονὸς,
Νυκτὸς τε πηγάς οὐρανοῦ τ' ἀναπτυχας,
Φοίβου τε παλαίδν κήπον.

² Odyss. iv. 562. The islands of the blessed, in Hesiod, are near the ocean (Opp. Di. 169).

³ Hesiod, Theogon. 275-290. Homer, Iliad, i. 423. Odyss. i. 23; ix. 86-206; x. 4-83; xii. 135. Minnern. Fragm. 13, Schneidewin.

⁴ Pindar, Pyth. x. 29—

Ναοῖς δ' οὐτε πεζδεὶς ἴων ἀν εύροις
Ἐς Ὑπερβορέον ἀγώνα θαυματάν ὀδόν.
Παρ' οἰς ποτε Περσεὺς ἀδαίσατο λαγέτας, &c.

Hesiod, and the old epic poem called the Epigoni, both mentioned the Hyperboreans (Herod. iv. 32-34).

⁵ This idea is well stated and sustained by Völcker (*Mythische Geographie der Griechen und Römer*, cap. i. p. 11), and by Nitzsch in his *Comments on the Odyssey—Introduct. Remarks to b. ix. p. xii.-xxxiii.* The twelfth and thirteenth chapters of the *History of Orchomenos*, by O.

they contributed much to pervert and confuse. For the navigator or emigrant, starting with an unsuspecting faith in their real existence, looked out for them in his distant voyages, and constantly fancied that he had seen or heard of them, so as to be able to identify their exact situation. The most contradictory accounts indeed, as might be expected, were often given respecting the latitude and longitude of such fanciful spots, but this did not put an end to the general belief in their real existence.

In the present advanced state of geographical knowledge, the story of that man who after reading Gulliver's Travels went to look in his map for Lilliput, appears an absurdity. But those who fixed the exact locality of the floating island of Æolus or the rocks of the Sirens did much the same;¹ and, with their ignorance of geography and imperfect appreciation of historical evidence, the error was hardly to be avoided. The ancient belief which fixed the Sirens on the islands of Sirenumæ off the coast of Naples—the Kyklôpes, Erytheia, and the Læstrygones in Sicily—the Lotophagi on the island of Méninx² near the Lesser Syrtis—the Phœakians at Korkyra—and the goddess Circé at the promontory of Circeum—took its rise at a time when these regions were first Hellenised and comparatively little visited. Once embodied in the local legends, and attested by visible monuments and ceremonies, it continued for a long time unassailed; and Thucydidès seems to adopt it, in reference to Korkyra and Sicily before the Hellenic colonisation, as matter of fact generally unquestioned. Müller, are also full of good remarks on the geography of the Argonautic voyage (pp. 274–299).

The most striking evidence of this disposition of the Greeks is to be found in the legendary discoveries of Alexander and his companions, when they marched over the untrdden regions in the east of the Persian empire (see Arrian, Hist. Al. v. 3: compare Lucian, Dialog. Mortuor. xiv. vol. i. p. 212, Tauch.), because these ideas were first broached at a time when geographical science was sufficiently advanced to canvass and criticise them. The early settlers in Italy, Sicily, and the Euxine, indulged their fanciful vision without the fear of any such monitor: there was no such thing as a map before the days of Anaximander, the disciple of Thalès.

¹ See Mr. Payne Knight, Prolegg. ad Homer. c. 49. Compare Spohn—“de extremâ Odysseæ parte”—p. 97.

² Strabo, xvii. p. 834. An altar of Odysseus was shown upon this island, as well as some other evidences (*σύμβολα*) of his visit to the place.

Apollônîus Rhodius copies the Odyssey in speaking of the island of Thrinakia and the cattle of Helios (iv. 965, with Schol.). He conceives Sicily as Thrinakia, a name afterwards exchanged for Trinakria. The Scholiast ad Apoll. (l. c.) speaks of Trinax king of Sicily. Compare iv. 291 with the Scholia.

able,¹ though little avouched as to details. But when geographical knowledge became extended, and the criticism upon the ancient epic was more or less systematised by the literary men of Alexandria and Pergamus, it appeared to many of them impossible that Odysseus could have seen so many wonders or undergone such monstrous dangers, within limits so narrow, and in the familiar track between the Nile and the Tiber. The scene of his weather-driven course was then shifted farther westward. Many convincing evidences were discovered, especially by Asklepiadēs of Myrlea, of his having visited various places in Iberia :² several critics imagined that

¹ Thucyd. i. 25–vi. 2. These local legends appear in the eyes of Strabo convincing evidence (i. p. 23–26)—the tomb of the siren Parthenopē at Naples, the stories at Cumae and Dikæarchia about the νεκυομαντεῖον of Avernus, and the existence of places named after Baius and Misēnus, the companions of Odysseus, &c.

² Strabo, iii. p. 150–157. Οὐ γάρ μόνον οἱ κατὰ τὴν Ἰταλίαν καὶ Σικελίαν τόποι καὶ ἄλλοι τινες τῶν τοιωτῶν σημεῖα ὑπογράφουσιν, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐν τῇ Ἰβηρίᾳ Ὁδύσσεια πόλις δείκνυται, καὶ Ἀθηνᾶς ἱερὸν, καὶ ἄλλα μύρια ἡχη τῆς ἐκείνου πλάνης, καὶ ἄλλων τῶν ἐκ τοῦ Τρωϊκοῦ πολέμου περιγενομένων (I adopt Grosskurd's correction of the text from γενομένων to περιγενομένων, in the note to his German translation of Strabo).

Asklepiadēs (of Myrlea in Bithynia, about 170 B.C.) resided some time in Turditania, the south-western region of Spain along the Guadalquivir, as a teacher of Greek literature (*παιδεύσας τὰ γραμματικὰ*), and composed a periegesis of the Iberian tribes, which unfortunately has not been preserved. He made various discoveries in archæology, and successfully connected his old legends with several portions of the territory before him. His discoveries were,—1. In the temple of Athénē, at this Iberian town of Odysseia, there were shields and beaks of ships affixed to the walls, monuments of the visit of Odysseus himself. 2. Among the Kallæki, in the northern part of Portugal, several of the companions of Teukros had settled and left descendants: there were in that region two Grecian cities, one called Hellenēs, the other called Amphilochi; for Amphilochus also, the son of Amphiaraus, had died in Iberia, and many of his soldiers had taken up their permanent residence in the interior. 3. Many new inhabitants had come into Iberia with the expedition of Hēraklēs; some also after the conquest of Messenē by the Lacedæmonians. 4. In Cantabria, on the north coast of Spain, there was a town and region of Lacedæmonian colonists. 5. In the same portion of the country there was the town of Opsikella, founded by Opsikellas, one of the companions of Antenor in his emigration from Troy (Strabo, iii. p. 157).

This is a specimen of the manner in which the seeds of Grecian mythus came to be distributed over so large a surface. To an ordinary Greek reader, these legendary discoveries of Asklepiadēs would probably be more interesting than the positive facts which he communicated respecting the Iberian tribes; and his Turditanian auditors would be delighted to hear—while he was reciting and explaining to them the animated passage of the Iliad, in which Agamemnōn extols the inestimable value of the bow of Teukros (viii. 281)—that the heroic archer and his companions had actually set foot in the Iberian peninsula.

he had wandered about in the Atlantic Ocean outside of the Strait of Gibraltar,¹ and they recognised a section of Lotophagi on the coast of Mauritania, over and above those who dwelt on the island of Mēninx.² On the other hand, Eratosthenēs and Apollodōrus treated the places visited by Odysseus as altogether unreal, for which scepticism they incurred much reproach.³

The fabulous island of Erytheia,—the residence of the three-headed Geryōn with his magnificent herd of oxen, under the custody of the two-headed dog Orthrus, described by Hesiod, like the garden of the Hesperides, as extra-terrestrial, on the farther side of the circumfluous ocean,—this island was supposed, by the interpreters of Stesichorus the poet, to be named by him off the south-western region of Spain called Tartēssus, and in the immediate vicinity of Gadēs. But the historian Hekatæus, in his anxiety to historicise the old fable, took upon himself to remove Erytheia from Spain nearer home to Epirus. He thought it incredible that Hēraklēs should have traversed Europe from east to west, for the purpose of bringing the cattle of Geryōn to Eurystheus at Mykēnæ, and he pronounced Geryōn to have been a king of Epirus, near the Gulf of Ambrakia. The oxen reared in that neighbourhood were proverbially magnificent, and to get them even from thence and bring them to Mykēnæ (he contended) was no inconsiderable task. Arrian, who cites this passage from Hekatæus, concurs in the same view,—an illustration of the licence with which ancient authors fitted on their fabulous geographical names to the real earth, and brought down the ethereal matter of legend to the lower atmosphere of history.⁴

¹ This was the opinion of Kratēs of Mallus, one of the most distinguished of the critics on Homer: it was the subject of an animated controversy between him and Aristarchus (Aulus Gellius, N. A. xiv. 6; Strabo, iii. p. 157). See the instructive treatise of Lehrs, *De Aristarchi Studiis*, c. v. § 4, p. 251. Much controversy also took place among the critics respecting the ground which Menelaus went over in his wanderings (*Odyss.* iv.). Kratēs affirmed that he had circumnavigated the southern extremity of Africa and gone to India: the critic Aristonikus, Strabo's contemporary, enumerated all the different opinions (Strabo, i. p. 38).

² Strabo, iii. p. 157.

³ Strabo, i. p. 22-44; vii. p. 299.

⁴ Stesichori Fragm. ed. Kleine; Geryonis, Fr. 5; p. 60; ap. Strabo, iii. p. 148; Herodot. iv. 8. It seems very doubtful whether Stesichorus meant to indicate any neighbouring island as Erytheia, if we compare Fragm. 10, p. 67 of the Geryonis, and the passages of Athenaeus and Eustathius there cited. He seems to have adhered to the old fable, placing Erytheia on the opposite side of the ocean-stream, for Hēraklēs crosses the ocean to get to it.

Both the track and the terminus of the Argonautic voyage appear in the most ancient epic as little within the conditions of reality, as the speaking timbers or the semi-divine crew of the vessel. In the *Odyssey*, *Æêtêts* and *Circê* (Hesiod names *Mêdeia* also) are brother and sister, offspring of *Hêlios*. The *Ææan* island, adjoining the circumfluous ocean, “where the house and dancing-ground of *Eôs* are situated, and where *Hêlios* rises,” is both the residence of *Circê* and of *Æêtêts*, inasmuch as *Odysseus*, in returning from the former, follows the same course as the *Argô* had previously taken in returning from the latter.¹ Even in the conception of *Mimnermus*, about 600 B.C., *Æa* still retained its fabulous attributes in conjunction with the ocean and *Hêlios*, without having been yet identified with any known portion of the solid earth;² and it was justly remarked by *Dêmêtrius* of *Skêpsis* in antiquity³ (though *Strabo* vainly tries to refute him), that neither *Homeric* nor *Mimnermus* designates *Kolchis* either as the residence of *Æêtêts*, or as

Hekataeus, ap. *Arrian. Histor. Alex. ii. 16.* *Skylax* places *Erytheia*, “whither *Geryôn* is said to have come to feed his oxen,” in the *Kastid* territory near the Greek city of *Apollônia* on the Ionic Gulf, northward of the *Keraunian* mountains. There were splendid cattle consecrated to *Hêlios* near *Apolloria*, watched by the citizens of the place with great care (*Herodot. ix. 93*; *Skylax*, c. 26).

About *Erytheia*, *Cellarius* observes (*Geogr. Ant. ii. 1, 127*), “*Insula Erytheia, quam veteres adjungunt Gadibus, vel demersa est, vel in scopulis quærenda, vel pars est ipsarum Gadium, neque hodie ejus formæ aliqua, uti descripta est, fertur superesse.*” To make the disjunctive catalogue complete, he ought to have added, “or it never really existed,”—not the least probable supposition of all.

¹ *Hesiod, Theogon. 956–992; Homer, Odyss. xii. 3–69—*

*Νῆσον ἐς Λιαίνην, ὅθι τ' Ἡοῦς ἡριγενεῖς
Οἰκία καὶ χοροὶ εἰσι, καὶ ἀντολαὶ ἡλίοιο.*

² *Mimnerm. Fragm. 10–11, Schneidewin; Athenæ. vii. p. 277—*

*Οὐδέ κοτ' ἄν μέγα κῶας ἀνήγαγεν αὐτὸς Ἰήσων
Ἐξ Αἴγης τελέσας ἀλγυδέσσαν ὁδὸν,
Ὑβριστῇ Πελεῖη τελέων χαλεπτρές ἀεθλον,
Οὐδ' αν ἐπ' Ὀκεανοῦ καλὸν εκοντο ρόον.*

** * * * **
*Αἴγατο πόλιν, τόθι τ' ὁκέος Ἡελίοιο
Ἀκτίνες χρυσέψεις τείνειν θαλάμω,
Ὀκεανοῦ παρὰ χείλεο, ἵν ψήσεις Ἰήσων.*

³ *Strabo, i. p. 45–46. Δημήτριος δὲ Σκῆψιος . . . πρὸς Νεάνθη τὸν Κυζικηνὸν φιλοτιμοτέρως ἀντιλέγων, εἰπόντα, ὅτι οἱ Ἀργοναῦται πλέοντες εἰς Φάσιν τὸν οὐφ' Ομήρου καὶ τῶν ἄλλων διολογούμενον πλοῦν, ἰδρύσαντο τὰ τῆς Ἰδαῖας μητρὸς ιερά ἐπὶ Κύζικον . . . ἀρχὴν φησὶ μηδ' εἰδέναι τὴν εἰς Φάσιν ἀποδημηλαν τοῦ ιάσονος Ομηρον. Again, p. 46, παραλαβὼν μάρτυρα Μίλμερμον, θεὸν τῷ Ὀκεανῷ ποιήσας οἰκησιν Αἴτου, &c.*

The adverb *φιλοτιμοτέρως* reveals to us the municipal rivalry and contention between the small town *Skêpsis* and its powerful neighbour *Kyzikus*, respecting points of comparative archaeology.

the terminus of the Argonautic voyage. Hesiod carried the returning Argonauts through the river Phasis into the ocean. But some of the poems ascribed to Eumēlus were the first which mentioned Aëtēs and Kolchis, and interwove both of them into the Corinthian mythical genealogy.¹ These poems seem to have been composed subsequent to the foundation of Sinopē, and to the commencement of Grecian settlement on the Borysthenēs, between the years 600 and 500 B.C. The Greek mariners who explored and colonised the southern coast of the Euxine, found at the extremity of their voyage the river Phasis and its barbarous inhabitants: it was the easternmost point which Grecian navigation (previous to the time of Alexander the Great) ever attained, and it was within sight of the impassable barrier of Caucasus.² They believed, not unnaturally, that they had here found "the house of Eōs (the morning) and the rising-place of the sun," and that the river Phasis, if they could follow it to its unknown beginning, would conduct them to the circumfluous ocean. They gave to the spot the name of Aëa, and the fabulous and real title gradually became associated together into one compound appellation,—the Kolchian Aëa, or Aëa of Kolchis.³ While Kolchis was thus entered on the map as a fit representative for the Homeric "house of the morning," the narrow strait of the Thracian Bosphorus attracted to itself the poetical fancy of the Symplēgades, or colliding rocks, through which the heaven-protected Argō had been the first to pass. The powerful Greek cities of Kyzikus, Hērakleia, and Sinopē, each fertile in local legends, still farther contributed to give this direction to the voyage; so that in the time of Hekataeus it had become the established belief that the Argō had started from Iôlkos and gone to Kolchis.

Aëtēs thus received his home from the legendary faith and fancy of the eastern Greek navigators: his sister Circē, originally his fellow-resident, was localised by the western. The Hesiodic and other poems, giving expression to the imaginative impulses of the inhabitants of Cumæ and other early Grecian settlers in Italy and Sicily,⁴ had referred the

¹ Eumēlus, *Fragm. Εὐρωπία 7, Κορινθιακὰ 2-5*, pp. 63-68, Dūntzer.

² Arrian, *Periplus Pont. Euxin.* p. 12; ap. *Geogr. Minor.* vol. i. He saw the Caucasus from Dioskuriæ.

³ Herodot. i. 2; vii. 193-197. Eurip. *Med.* 2. Valer. Flacc. v. 51.

⁴ Strabo, i. p. 23. Völcker (*Ueber Homerische Geographie*, v. 66) is instructive upon this point, as upon the geography of the Greek poets generally. He recognises the purely mythical character of Aëa in Homer and Hesiod, but he tries to prove—unsuccessfully in my judgement—that

wanderings of Odysseus to the western or Tyrrhenian sea, and had planted the Cyclôpes, the Læstrygones, the floating island of Æolus, the Lotophagi, the Phœaciens, &c., about the coast of Sicily, Italy, Libya, and Korkyra. In this way the Ææan island—the residence of Circê, and the extreme point of the wanderings of Odysseus, from whence he passes only to the ocean and into Hadês—came to be placed in the far west, while the Æa of Æêtês was in the far east—not unlike our East and West Indies. The homer : brother and sister were separated and sent to opposite extremities of the Grecian terrestrial horizon.¹

The track from Iôlkos to Kolchis, however, though plausible as far as it went, did not realise all the conditions of the genuine fabulous voyage: it did not explain the evidences of the visit of these maritime heroes which were to be found in Libya, in Krête, in Anaphê, in Korkyra, in the Adriatic Gulf, in Italy, and in Æthalia. It became necessary to devise another route for them in their return, and the Hesiodic narrative was (as I have before observed), that they came back by the circumfluous ocean: first going up the river Phasis into the circumfluous ocean; then following that deep and gentle stream until they entered the Nile, and came down its course to the coast of Libya. This seems also to have been the belief of Hekataeus.² But presently several Greeks (and

Homer places Æêtês in the east, while Circê is in the west, and that Homer refers the Argonautic voyage to the Euxine Sea.

¹ Strabo (or Polybius, whom he has just been citing) contends that Homer knew the existence of Æêtês in Kolchis, and of Circê at Circeum, as historical persons, as well as the voyage of Jasôn to Æa as an historical fact. Upon this he (Homer) built a superstructure of fiction (*τροσμύθευμα*): he invented the brotherhood between them, and he placed both the one and the other in the exterior ocean (*συγγενελας τε ἐπλαστέ τῶν οὖτω διφκισμένων, καὶ ἔξωκενισμὸν ἀμφοῖν*, i. p. 20); perhaps also Jasôn might have wandered as far as Italy, as evidences (*σημεῖά τινα*) are shown that he did (ib.).

But the idea that Homer conceived Æêtês in the extreme east and Circê in the extreme west, is not reconcileable with the Odyssey. The supposition of Strabo is alike violent and unsatisfactory.

Circê was worshipped as a goddess at Circeii (Cicero, *Nat. Deor.* iii. 19). Hesiod, in the *Theogony*, represents the two sons of Circê by Odysseus as reigning over all the warlike Tyrrhenians (*Theog.* 1012), an undefined western sovereignty. The great Mamilian gens at Tusculum traced their descent to Odysseus and Circê (*Dionys. Hal.* iv. 45).

² There is an opinion cited from Hekataeus in Schol. *Apoll. Rhod.* iv. 284, contrary to this, which is given by the same scholiast on iv. 259. But, in spite of the remarks of Clausen (*ad Fragment. Hekataei*, 187, p. 98), I think that the Schol. *ad iv. 284* has made a mistake in citing Hekataeus; the more so, as the scholiast, as printed from the *Codex Parisinus*.

Herodotus among them) began to discard the idea of a circumfluous ocean-stream, which had pervaded their old geographical and astronomical fables, and which explained the supposed easy communication between one extremity of the earth and another. Another idea was then started for the returning voyage of the Argonauts. It was supposed that the river Ister, or Danube, flowing from the Rhipæan mountains in the north-west of Europe, divided itself into two branches, one of which fell into the Euxine Sea, and the other into the Adriatic.

The Argonauts, fleeing from the pursuit of *Æêtës*, had been obliged to abandon their regular course homeward, and had gone from the Euxine Sea up the Ister; then passing down the other branch of that river, they had entered into the Adriatic, the Kolchian pursuers following them. Such is the story given by Apollônias Rhodius from *Timagétus*, and accepted even by so able a geographer as *Eratosthenës*—who preceded him by one generation, and who, though sceptical in regard to the localities visited by *Odysseus*, seems to have been a firm believer in the reality of the Argonautic voyage.¹ Other historians again, among whom was *Timæus*, though they considered the ocean as an outer sea, and no longer admitted the existence of the old Homeric ocean-stream, yet imagined a story for the return-voyage of the Argonauts somewhat resembling the old tale of *Hesiod* and *Hekataeus*. They alleged that the *Argô*, after entering into the *Palus Maeotis*, had followed the upward course of the river *Tanais*; that she had then been carried overland and launched in a river which had its mouth in the ocean or great outer sea. When in the

cites the same opinion without mentioning *Hekataeus*. According to the old Homeric idea, the ocean-stream flowed all round the earth, and was the source of all the principal rivers which flowed into the great internal sea, or *Mediterranean* (see *Hekataeus*, Fr. 349; *Klausen*, ap. *Arrian*. ii. 16, where he speaks of the *Mediterranean* as the *μεγάλη θάλασσα*). Retaining this old idea of the ocean-stream, *Hekataeus* would naturally believe that the *Phasis* joined it: nor can I agree with *Klausen* (ad Fr. 187) that this implies a degree of ignorance too gross to impute to him.

¹ *Apollôn. Rhod.* iv. 287; *Schol. ad iv. 284*; *Pindar, Pyth.* iv. 447, with *Schol.*; *Strabo*, i. p. 46–57; *Aristot. Mirabil. Auscult.* c. 105. Altars were shown in the Adriatic, which had been erected both by *Jasōn* and by *Mèdea* (ib.).

Aristotle believed in the forked course of the Ister, with one embouchure in the Euxine and another in the Adriatic: he notices certain fishes called *τρίχαι*, who entered the river (like the Argonauts) from the Euxine, went up it as far as the point of bifurcation and descended into the Adriatic (*Histor. Animal.* viii. 15). Compare *Ukert, Geographie der Griech. und Römer*, vol. iii. p. 145–147, about the supposed course of the Ister.

ocean, she had coasted along the north and west of Europe until she reached Gadès and the strait of Gibraltar, where she entered into the Mediterranean, and there visited the many places specified in the fable. Of this long voyage, in the outer sea to the north and west of Europe, many traces were affirmed to exist along the coast of the ocean.¹ There was again a third version, according to which the Argonauts came back as they went, through the Thracian Bosphorus and the Hellespont. In this way geographical plausibility was indeed maintained, but a large portion of the fabulous matter was thrown overboard.²

Such were the various attempts made to reconcile the Argonautic legend with enlarged geographical knowledge and improved historical criticism. The problem remained unsolved, but the faith in the legend did not the less continue. It was a faith originally generated at a time when the unassisted narrative of the inspired poet sufficed for the conviction of his hearers; it consecrated one among the capital exploits of that heroic and superhuman race, whom the Greek was accustomed at once to look back upon as his ancestors and to worship conjointly with his gods: it lay too deep in his mind either to require historical evidence for his support, or to be overthrown by geographical difficulties as they were then appreciated. Supposed traces of the past event, either preserved in the names of places, or embodied in standing religious customs with their explanatory comments, served as sufficient authentication in the eyes of the curious inquirer. And even men trained in a more severe school of criticism contented themselves with eliminating the palpable contradictions and softening down the supernatural and romantic events, so as to produce an Argonautic expedition of their own invention as the true and accredited history. Strabo, though he can neither overlook nor explain the geographical impossibilities of the narrative, supposes himself to have discovered the basis of actual fact, which the original poets had embellished or

¹ Diodör. iv. 56: *Timaeus*, Fragm. 53, Göller. *Skymnus* the geographer also adopted this opinion (Schol. Apoll. Rhod. 284-287). The pseudo-Orpheus in the poem called *Argonautica* seems to give a jumble of all the different stories.

² Diodör. iv. 49. This was the tale both of Sophoklēs and of Kallimachus (Schol. Apoll. Rhod. iv. 284).

See the Dissertation of Ukert, *Beylage* iv. vol. i. part 2, p. 320 of his *Geographie der Griechen und Römer*, which treats of the Argonautic voyage at some length; also J. H. Voss, *Alte Weltkunde über die Gestalt der Erde*, published in the second volume of the *Kritische Blätter*, pp. 162, 314-326; and Forbiger, *Handbuch der Alten Geographie*-Einleitung, p. 8.

exaggerated. The golden fleece was typical of the great wealth of Kolchis, arising from gold-dust washed down by the rivers ; and the voyage of Jasōn was in reality an expedition at the head of a considerable army, with which he plundered this wealthy country and made extensive conquests in the interior.¹ Strabo has nowhere laid down what he supposes to have been the exact measure and direction of Jasōn's march, but he must have regarded it as very long, since he classes Jasōn with Dionysus and Hēraklēs, and emphatically characterises all the three as having traversed wider spaces of ground than any moderns could equal.² Such was the compromise which a mind like that of Strabo made with the ancient legends. He shaped or cut them down to the level of his own credence, and in this waste of historical criticism, without any positive evidence, he took to himself the credit of greater penetration than the literal believers, while he escaped the necessity of breaking formally with the bygone heroic world.

CHAPTER XIV

LEGENDS OF THEBES

THE Bœôtians generally, throughout the historical age, though well endowed with bodily strength and courage,³ are

¹ Strabo, i. p. 45. He speaks here of the voyage of Phryxus, as well as that of Jasōn, as having been a military undertaking (*στρατεία*) : so again, iii. p. 149, he speaks of the military expedition of Odysseus—ἡ τοῦ Ὀδυσσέως στρατιὰ, and ἡ Ἡρακλέους στρατιὰ (ib.). Again, xi. p. 498. Οἱ μῦθοι, αἰνιττόμενοι τὴν Ἰάσονος στρατείαν προελθόντος μέχρι καὶ Μηδίας. έτι δὲ πρότερον τὴν Φρίξου. Compare also Justin, xlii. 2-3 ; Tacit. Annal. vi. 34.

Strabo cannot speak of the old fables with literal fidelity : he unconsciously transforms them into quasi-historical incidents of his own imagination. Diodōrus gives a narrative of the same kind, with decent substitutes for the fabulous elements (iv. 40-47-56).

² Strabo, i. p. 48. The far-extending expeditions undertaken in the eastern regions by Dionysus and Hēraklēs were constantly present to the mind of Alexander the Great as subjects of comparison with himself: he imposed upon his followers perilous and trying marches, from anxiety to equal or surpass the alleged exploits of Semiramis, Cyrus, Perseus, and Hēraklēs. (Arrian, v. 2, 3; vi. 24, 3; vii. 10, 12. Strabo, iii. p. 171 ; xv. p. 686 ; xvii. p. 81.)

³ The eponym Bœôtus is son of Poseidōn and Arnē (Euphorion ap. Eustath. ad Iliad. ii. 507). It was from Arnē in Thessaly that the Bœôtians were said to have come, when they invaded and occupied Bœôtia.

represented as proverbially deficient in intelligence, taste, and fancy. But the legendary population of Thêbes, the Kadmeians, are rich in mythical antiquities, divine as well as heroic. Both Dionysus and Hêraklês recognise Thêbes as their natal city. Moreover, the two sieges of Thêbes by Adrastus, even taken apart from Kadmus, Antiopê, Amphiôn and Zethus, &c., are the most prominent and most characteristic exploits, next to the siege of Troy, of that pre-existing race of heroes who lived in the imagination of the historical Hellênes.

It is not Kadmus, but the brothers Amphiôn and Zethus, who are given to us in the *Odyssey* as the first founders of Thêbes and the first builders of its celebrated walls. They are the sons of Zeus by Antiôpe, daughter of Asôpus. The scholiasts, who desire to reconcile this tale with the more current account of the foundation of Thêbes by Kadmus, tell us that after the death of Amphiôn and Zethus, Eurymachus the warlike king of the Phlegyæ, invaded and ruined the newly-settled town, so that Kadmus on arriving was obliged to re-found it.¹ But Apollodôrus, and seemingly the older logographers before him, placed Kadmus at the top, and inserted the two brothers at a lower point in the series. According to them, Bêlus and Agenôr were the sons of Epaphus (son of the Argeian Iô) by Libya. Agenôr went to Phœnicia and there became king: he had for his offspring Kadmus, Phœnix, Kilix, and a daughter Eurôpa; though in the *Iliad* Eurôpa is called daughter of Phœnix.² Zeus fell in love with Eurôpa, and assuming the shape of a bull, carried her across the sea upon his back from Egypt to Krête, where she bore to him Minôs, Rhadamanthus, and Sarpêdôn. Two out of the three sons sent out by Agenôr in search of their lost sister, wearied out by a long-protracted as well as fruitless voyage, abandoned the idea of returning home: Kilix settled

Euripidês made him son of Poseidôn and Melanippê. Another legend recited Bœôtus and Hellêن as sons of Poseidôn and Antiopê (Hygin. f. 157-186).

The Tanagræan poetess Korinna (the rival of Pindar, whose compositions in the Bœôtian dialect are unfortunately lost) appears to have dwelt upon this native Bœôtian genealogy: she derived the Ogygian gates of Thêbes from Ogygus, son of Bœôtus (Schol. Apollôn. Rhod. iii. 1178), also the Fragments of Korinna in Schneidewin's edition, fr. 2, p. 432.

¹ Homer, *Odyss.* xi. 262, and Eustath. ad loc. Compare Schol. ad *Iliad.* xiii. 301.

² *Iliad.* xiv. 321. Iô is *κεροέσσα προμάτωρ* of the Thêbans. Eurip. *Phœniss.* 247-676.

in Kilikia, and Kadmus in Thrace.¹ Thasus, the brother or nephew of Kadmus, who had accompanied them in the voyage, settled and gave name to the island of Thasus.

Both Herodotus and Euripidēs represent Kadmus as an emigrant from Phœnicia, conducting a body of followers in quest of Eurōpa. The account of Apollodōrus describes him as having come originally from Libya or Egypt to Phœnicia: we may presume that this was also the statement of the earlier logographers Pherekydēs and Hellanikus. Conôn, who historicises and politicises the whole legend, seems to have found two different accounts; one connecting Kadmus with Egypt, another bringing him from Phœnicia. He tries to melt down the two into one, by representing that the Phœnicians, who sent out Kadmus, had acquired great power in Egypt—that the seat of their kingdom was the Egyptian Thébes—that Kadmus was despatched, under pretence indeed of finding his lost sister, but really on a project of conquest—and that the name Thébes, which he gave to his new establishment in Bœotia, was borrowed from Thébes in Egypt, his ancestral seat.²

Kadmus went from Phœnicia to Thrace, and from Thrace to Delphi to procure information respecting his sister Eurōpa, but the god directed him to take no farther trouble about her; he was to follow the guidance of a cow, and to found a city on the spot where the animal should lie down. The condition was realised on the site of Thébes. The neighbouring fountain Areia was guarded by a fierce dragon, the offspring of Arēs, who destroyed all the persons sent to fetch water. Kadmus killed the dragon, and at the suggestion of Athénē sowed the dragon's teeth in the earth:³ there sprang up at once the

¹ Apollodōr. ii. 1, 3; iii. 1, 8. In the Hesiodic poems (ap. Schol. Apoll. Rhod. ii. 178) Phœnix was recognised as son of Agenōr. Pherekydēs also described both Phœnix and Kadmus as sons of Agenōr (Pherekyd. Fragm. 40, Didot). Compare Servius ad Virgil. Aeneid. i. 338. Pherekydēs expressly mentioned Kilix (Apollod. ib.). Besides the *Εὐρώπεια* of Stesichorus (see Stesichor. Fragm. xv. p. 73, ed. Kleine), there were several other ancient poems on the adventures of Eurōpa; one in particular by Eumēlus (Schol. ad Iliad. vi. 138), which, however, can hardly be the same as the *τὰ ἔπη τὰ εἰς Εὐρώπην* alluded to by Pausanias (ix. 5, 4). See Wüllner de Cyclo Epico, p. 57 (Münster, 1825).

² Conôn, Narrat. 37. Perhaps the most remarkable thing of all is the tone of unbounded self-confidence with which Conôn winds up this tissue of uncertified suppositions—περὶ μὲν Κάδμους καὶ Θηβῶν οἰκίσεως οὗτος δὲ ἀληθῆς λόγος· τὸ δὲ ἔλλο μῦθος καὶ γοητεῖα ἀκοῦης.

³ Stesichor. (Fragm. 16; Kleine) ap. Schol. Eurip. Phœniss. 680. The place where the heifer had lain down was still shown in the time of Pausanias (ix. 12, 1).

armed men called the Sparti, among whom he flung stones, and they immediately began to assault each other until all were slain except five. Arès, indignant at this slaughter, was about to kill Kadmus; but Zeus appeased him, condemning Kadmus to an expiatory servitude of eight years, after which he married Harmonia, the daughter of Arès and Aphroditê—presenting to her the splendid necklace fabricated by the hand of Héphæstos, which had been given by Zeus to Eurôpa.¹ All the gods came to the Kadmeia, the citadel of Thêbes, to present congratulations and gifts at these nuptials, which seem to have been hardly less celebrated in the mythical world than those of Pèleus and Thetis. The issue of the marriage was one son, Polydôrus, and four daughters, Autonoë, Inô, Semelê and Agavê.²

From the five who alone survived of the warriors sprung from the dragon's teeth, arose five great families or gentes in Thêbes; the oldest and noblest of its inhabitants, coeval with the foundation of the town. They were called Sparti, and their name seems to have given rise, not only to the fable of the sowing of the teeth, but also to other etymological narratives.³

All the four daughters of Kadmus are illustrious in fabulous history. Inô, wife of Athamas, the son of Æolus, has already been included among the legends of the Æolidi. Semelê became the mistress of Zeus, and inspired Hérê with jealousy. Misguided by the malicious suggestions of that goddess, she solicited Zeus to visit her with all the solemnity and terrors which surrounded him when he approached Hérê herself.

Lysimachus, a lost author who wrote *Thebaïca*, mentioned Eurôpa as having come with Kadmus to Thêbes, and told the story in many other respects very differently (Schol. Apoll. Rhod. iii. 1179).

¹ Apollodôr. iii. 4, 1-3. Pherekydês gave this account of the necklace, which seems to imply that Kadmus must have found his sister Eurôpa. The narrative here given is from Hellanikus; that of Pherekydês differed from it in some respects; compare Hellanik. Fragm. 8 and 9, and Pherekyd. Frag. 44. The resemblance of this story with that of Jasôn and Æêtê (see above, chap. xiii.) will strike every one. It is curious to observe how the old logographer Pherekydês explained this analogy in his narrative; he said that Athénê had given half the dragon's teeth to Kadmus and half to Æêtê (see Schol. Pindar. Isthm. vi. 13).

² Hesiod, Theogon. 976. Leukothea, the sea-goddess, daughter of Kadmus, is mentioned in the *Odyssey*, v. 334; Diodôr. iv. 2.

³ Eurip. Phœniss. 680, with the Scholia; Pherekydês, Fragm. 44; Andròtion, ap. Schol. Pindar. Isthm. vi. 13. Dionysius (?) called the Sparti an *έθνος Βοιωτας* (Schol. Phœniss. l. c.).

Even in the days of Plutarch there were persons living who traced their descent to the Sparti of Thêbes (Plutarch, Ser. Num. Vindict. p. 563).

The god unwillingly consented, and came in his chariot in the midst of thunder and lightning, under which awful accompaniments the mortal frame of Semelē perished. Zeus, taking from her the child of which she was pregnant, sewed it into his own thigh: after the proper interval the child was brought out and born, and became the great god Dionysus or Bacchus. Hermēs took him to Inō and Athamas to receive their protection. Afterwards, however, Zeus having transformed him into a kid to conceal him from the persecution of Hērē, the nymphs of the mountain Nysa became his nurses.¹

Autonoē, the third daughter of Kadmus, married the pastoral hero or god Aristaeus, and was mother of Aktæôn, a devoted hunter and a favourite companion of the goddess Artemis. She however became displeased with him—either because he looked into a fountain while she was bathing and saw her naked—or, according to the legend set forth by the poet Stesichorus, because he loved and courted Semelē—or according to Euripidēs, because he presumptuously vaunted himself as her superior in the chase. She transformed him into a stag, so that his own dogs set upon and devoured him. The rock upon which Aktæôn used to sleep when fatigued with the chase, and the spring whose transparent waters had too clearly revealed the form of the goddess, were shown to Pausanias near Platæa, on the road to Megara.²

¹ Apollodōr. iii. 4, 2–9; Diodōr. iv. 2.

² See Apollodōr. iii. 4, 3; Stesichor. Fragm. xvii. Kleine; Pausan. ix. 2, 3; Eurip. Bacch. 337; Diodōr. iv. 81. The old logographer Akusilaus copied Stesichorus.

Upon this well-known story it is unnecessary to multiply references. I shall however briefly notice the remarks made upon it by Diodōrus and by Pausanias, as an illustration of the manner in which the literary Greeks of a later day dealt with their old national legends.

Both of them appear implicitly to believe the fact, that Aktæôn was devoured by his own dogs, but they differ materially in the explanation of it.

Diodōrus accepts and vindicates the miraculous interposition of the displeased goddess to punish Aktæôn, who, according to one story, had boasted of his superiority in the chase to Artemis,—according to another story, had presumed to solicit the goddess in marriage, emboldened by the great numbers of the feet of animals slain in the chase which he had hung up as offerings in her temple. “It is not improbable (observes Diodōrus) that the goddess was angry on both these accounts. For whether Aktæôn abused these hunting presents so far as to make them the means of gratifying his own desires towards one unapproachable in wedlock, or whether he presumed to call himself an abler hunter than her with whom the gods themselves will not compete in this department,—in either case the wrath of the goddess against him was just and legitimate (*διμολογουμένην καλ δικαλαν ὄργην ξσχε πόδες αὐτὸν ἡ θεός*). With perfect propriety therefore

Agavê, the remaining daughter of Kadmus, married Echiôn, one of the Sparti. The issue of these nuptials was Pentheus, who, when Kadmus became old, succeeded him as king of Thêbes. In his reign Dionysus appeared as a god, the author or discoverer of the vine with all its blessings. He had wandered over Asia, India and Thrace, at the head of an excited troop of female enthusiasts—communicating and inculcating everywhere the Bacchic ceremonies, and rousing in the minds of women that impassioned religious emotion which led them to ramble in solitary mountains at particular seasons, there to give vent to violent fanatical excitement, apart from the men, clothed in fawn-skins and armed with the thyrsus. The obtrusion of a male spectator upon these solemnities was esteemed sacrilegious. Though the rites had been rapidly disseminated and fervently welcomed in many parts of Thrace, yet there were some places in which they had been obstinately resisted and their votaries treated with rudeness; especially by Lykurgus, king of the Edonian Thracians, upon whom a sharp and exemplary punishment was inflicted by Dionysus.

Thêbes was the first city of Greece to which Dionysus came, at the head of his Asiatic troop of females, to obtain divine honours, and to establish his peculiar rites in his native city. The venerable Kadmus, together with his daughters and the prophet Teiresias, at once acknowledged the divinity of the new god, and began to offer their worship and praise to him, along with the solemnities which he enjoined. But Pentheus vehemently opposed the new ceremonies, reproving and maltreating the god who introduced them: nor was his unbelief at all softened by the miracles which Dionysus wrought for his own protection and for that of his followers. His mother Agavê, with her sisters and a large body of other women from Thêbes, had gone out from Thêbes to Mount Kithærôn to

(Καθόλου δὲ πιθανῶς) was he transformed into an animal such as those he had hunted, and torn to pieces by the very dogs who had killed them." (Diod. iv. 80.)

Pausanias, a man of exemplary piety, and generally less inclined to scepticism than Diodôrus, thinks the occasion unsuitable for a miracle or special interference. Having alluded to the two causes assigned for the displeasure of Artemis (they are the two first mentioned in my text, and distinct from the two noticed by Diodôrus), he proceeds to say, "But I believe that the dogs of Aktæôn went mad, without the interference of the goddess: in this state of madness they would have torn in pieces without distinction any one whom they met (Paus. ix. 2, 3. ἐγὼ δὲ καὶ ἄνευ θεοῦ πειθόμας νόσον λύσσαν ἐπιβαλεῖν τοῦ Ἀκταίων τοὺς κύνας)." He retains the truth of the final catastrophe, but rationalises it, excluding the special intervention of Artemis.

celebrate their solemnities under the influence of the Bacchic frenzy. Thither Pentheus followed to watch them, and there the punishment due to his impiety overtook him. The avenging touch of the god having robbed him of his senses, he climbed a tall pine for the purpose of overlooking the feminine multitude, who detected him in this position, pulled down the tree, and tore him in pieces. Agavê, mad and bereft of consciousness, made herself the foremost in this assault, and carried back in triumph to Thêbes the head of her slaughtered son. The aged Kadmus, with his wife Harmonia, retired among the Illyrians, and at the end of their lives were changed into serpents, Zeus permitting them to be transferred to the Elysian fields.¹

Polydôrus and Labdakus successively became kings of Thêbes: the latter at his death left an infant son, Laius, who was deprived of his throne by Lykus. And here we approach the legend of Antiopê, Zéthus and Amphiôn, whom the fabulists insert at this point of the Thêban series. Antiopê is here the daughter of Nykteus, the brother of Lykus. She is deflowered by Zeus, and then, while pregnant, flies to Epôpeus,

¹ Apollod. iii. 5, 3-4; Theocrit. Idyll. xxvi. Eurip. Bacch. *passim*. Such is the tragical plot of this memorable drama. It is a striking proof of the deep-seated reverence of the people of Athens for the sanctity of the Bacchic ceremonies, that they could have borne the spectacle of Agavê on the stage with her dead son's head, and the expressions of triumphant sympathy in her action on the part of the Chorus (1168), *Μάκαρ' Αγανή!* This drama, written near the close of the life of Euripidês, and exhibited by his son after his death (Schol. Aristoph. Ran. 67), contains passages strongly inculcating the necessity of implicit deference to ancestral authority in matters of religion, and favourably contrasting the uninquiring faith of the vulgar with the dissenting and inquisitive tendencies of superior minds: see v. 196; compare vv. 389 and 422—

Οὐδὲν σοφιζόμεθα τοῖσι δαιμοῖσιν.
Πατρίος παραδοχὰς, ἃς θ' ὀμῆλικας χρόνῳ
Κεκτήμεθ, οὐδεὶς αὐτὰ καταβαλεῖ λόγος,
Οὐδὲ ην δι' ἄκρων τὸ σοφὸν εὑρηται φρένων.

Such reproofs “insanientis sapientiae” certainly do not fall in with the plot of the drama itself, in which Pentheus appears as a Conservative, resisting the introduction of the new religious rites. Taken in conjunction with the emphatic and submissive piety which reigns through the drama, they countenance the supposition of Tyrwhitt, that Euripidês was anxious to repel the imputations, so often made against him, of commerce with the philosophers, and participation in sundry heretical opinions.

Pacuvius in his Pentheus seems to have closely copied Euripidês; see Servius ad Virg. *Aeneid*. iv. 469.

The old Thespis had composed a tragedy on the subject of Pentheus: Suidas, *Θέσπις*; also Aeschylus; compare his *Eumenidê*, 25.

According to Apollodorus (iii. 5, 5), Labdakus also perished in a similar way to Pentheus, and from the like impiety,—*ἴκειν φρονῶν παραπλήσια*.

king of Sikyôn: Nykteus dying entreats his brother to avenge the injury, and Lykus accordingly invades Sikyôn, defeats and kills Epôpeus, and brings back Antiopê prisoner to Thêbes. In her way thither, in a cave near Eleutheræ, which was shown to Pausanias,¹ she is delivered of the twin sons of Zeus—Amphiôn and Zéthus—who, exposed to perish, are taken up and nourished by a shepherd, and pass their youth amidst herdsmen, ignorant of their lofty descent.

Antiopê is conveyed to Thêbes, where, after undergoing a long persecution from Lykus and his cruel wife Dirkê, she at length escapes, and takes refuge in the pastoral dwelling of her sons, now grown to manhood. Dirkê pursues and requires her to be delivered up; but the sons recognise and protect their mother, taking an ample revenge upon her persecutors. Lykus is slain, and Dirkê is dragged to death, tied to the horns of a bull.² Amphiôn and Zéthus, having banished Laius, become kings of Thêbes. The former, taught by Hermês, and possessing exquisite skill on the lyre, employs it in fortifying the city, the stones of the walls arranging themselves spontaneously in obedience to the rhythm of his song.³

Zéthus marries Aêdôn, who, in the dark and under a fatal mistake, kills her son Itylus: she is transformed into a

¹ Pausan. i. 38, 9.

² For the adventures of Antiopê and her sons, see Apollodôr. iii. 5; Pausan. ii. 6, 2; ix. 5, 2.

The narrative given respecting Epôpeus in the ancient Cyprian verses seems to have been very different from this, as far as we can judge from the brief notice in Proclus's Argument,—*ἀς Ἐπωπεὺς φθείρας τὴν Λυκούργου (Λύκου) γυναῖκα ἐξεπορθθη*: it approaches more nearly to the story given in the seventh fable of Hyginus, and followed by Propertius (iii. 15); the eighth fable of Hyginus contains the tale of Antiopê as given by Euripidês and Ennius. The story of Pausanias differs from both.

The Scholiast ad Apollôn. Rhod. i. 735, says that there were two persons named Antiopê; one, daughter of Asôpus, the other, daughter of Nykteus. Pausanias is content with supposing one only, really the daughter of Nykteus, but there was a φήμη that she was daughter of Asôpus (ii. 6, 2). Asius made Antiopê daughter of Asôpus, and mother (both by Zeus and by Epôpeus: such a junction of divine and human paternity is of common occurrence in the Greek legends) of Zéthus and Amphiôn (ap. Paus. I. c.).

The contradictory versions of the story are brought together, though not very perfectly, in Sterk's Essay, *De Labdacidarum Historiâ*, p. 38-43 (Leyden, 1829).

³ This story about the lyre of Amphiôn is not noticed in Homer, but it was narrated in the ancient *Ἐπη ἐς Εὐρώπην* which Pausanias had read: the wild beasts as well as the stones were obedient to his strains (Paus. ix. 5, 4). Pherekydês also recounted it (Pherekyd. Fragm. 102, Didot). The tablet of inscription ('Αναγραφή) at Sikyôn recognised Amphiôn as the first composer of poetry and harp-music (Plutarch, *de Musicâ*, c. 3, p. 1132).

nightingale, while Zéthus dies of grief.¹ Amphiôn becomes the husband of Niobê, daughter of Tantalus, and the father of a numerous offspring, the complete extinction of which by the hands of Apollo and Artemis has already been recounted in these pages.

Here ends the legend of the beautiful Antiope and her twin sons—the rude and unpolished, but energetic, Zéthus—and the refined and amiable, but dreamy, Amphiôn. For so Euripidês, in the drama of Antiope unfortunately lost, presented the two brothers, in affectionate union as well as in striking contrast.² It is evident that the whole story stood originally quite apart from the Kadmeian family, and so the rudiments of it yet stand in the *Odyssey*; but the logographers, by their ordinary connecting artifices, have opened a vacant place for it in the descending series of Thêban mythes. And they have here proceeded in a manner not usual with them. For whereas they are generally fond of multiplying entities, and supposing different historical personages of the same name, in order to introduce an apparent smoothness in the chronology—they have here blended into one person Amphiôn the son of Antiope and Amphiôn the father of Chlôris, who seem clearly distinguished from each other in the *Odyssey*. They have farther assigned to the same person all the circumstances of the legend of Niobê, which seems to have been originally framed quite apart from the sons of Antiope.

Amphiôn and Zéthus being removed, Laius became king of Thêbes. With him commences the ever-celebrated series of adventures of Oedipus and his family. Laius, forewarned by the oracle that any son whom he might beget would kill him, caused Oedipus as soon as he was born to be exposed on Mount Kithærôn. Here the herdsmen of Polybus king of

¹ The tale of the wife and son of Zéthus is as old as the *Odyssey* (xix. 525). Pausanias adds the statement that Zéthus died of grief (ix. 5, 5; Pherekydês, Frigm. 102, Did.). Pausanias, however, as well as Apollo-dôrus, tells us that Zéthus married Thêbê, from whom the name Thêbes was given to the city. To reconcile the conflicting pretensions of Zéthus and Amphiôn with those of Kadmus, as founders of Thêbes, Pausanias supposes that the latter was the original settler of the hill of the Kadmeia, while the two former extended the settlement to the lower city (ix. 5, 1-3).

² See Valckenaer, *Diatribê* in Eurip. *Reliq.* cap. 7, p. 58; Welcker, *Griechisch. Tragôd.* ii. p. 811. There is a striking resemblance between the Antiope of Euripidês and the Tyrô of Sophoklês in many points.

Plato in his *Gorgias* has preserved a few fragments, and a tolerably clear general idea of the characters of Zéthus and Amphiôn (*Gorg.* 90-92); see also Horat. *Epist.* i. 18, 42.

Both Livius and Pacuvius had tragedies on the scheme of this of Euripidês, the former seemingly a translation.

Corinth accidentally found him and conveyed him to their master, who brought him up as his own child. In spite of the kindest treatment, however, Œdipus when he grew up found himself exposed to taunts on the score of his unknown parentage, and went to Delphi to inquire of the god the name of his real father. He received for answer an admonition not to go back to his country ; if he did so, it was his destiny to kill his father and become the husband of his mother. Knowing no other country but Corinth, he accordingly determined to keep away from that city, and quitted Delphi by the road towards Boeotia and Phôkis. At the exact spot where the roads leading to these two countries forked, he met Laius in a chariot drawn by mules, when the insolence of one of the attendants brought on an angry quarrel, in which Œdipus killed Laius, not knowing him to be his father.¹

On the death of Laius, Kreôn, the brother of Jokasta, succeeded to the kingdom of Thêbes. At this time the country was under the displeasure of the gods, and was vexed by a terrible monster, with the face of a woman, the wings of a bird, and the tail of a lion, called the Sphinx²—sent by the wrath of Hêrê, and occupying the neighbouring mountain of Phikium. The Sphinx had learned from the Muses a riddle, which she proposed to the Thêbans to resolve ; on every occasion of failure she took away one of the citizens and ate him up. Still no person could solve the riddle ; and so great was the suffering occasioned, that Kreôn was obliged to offer both the crown and the nuptials of his sister Jokasta to any one who could

¹ The spot called *σχιστὴ δός* (the Divided Way) where this event happened was memorable in the eyes of all literary Greeks, and is specially noticed by the traveller Pausanias, who still saw there (x. 5, 2) the tombs of Laius and his attendant. It is moreover in itself a very marked place, where the valley which runs north and south, from Daulis to Ambrysus and Antikyra, is met half way from the westward at right angles, but not crossed, by the ravine, which ascends from the Krissæan plain, passes under Delphi, reaches its highest point at Arakhova above Delphi, and then descends towards the east. Travellers going eastward from Delphi must always have been stopped at this place by the precipices of Helikon, and must have turned either to the right or to the left. If to the right, they would descend to the Gulf, or they might make their way into Boeotia by the southern passes, as Kleombrotus did before the battle of Leuktra : if to the left, they would turn the south-east angle of Parnassus, and make their way by Daulis to the valley of Chæroneia and Elateia. Compare the description in K. O. Müller, *Orchomenos*, c. i. p. 37.

² Apollodôr. iii. 5, 8. An author named Lykus, in his work entitled *Thêbaica*, ascribed this visitation to the anger of Dionysus (Schol. Hesiod. Theogon. 326). The Sphinx (or *Phix*, from the Boeotian Mount Phikium) is as old as the Hesiodic Theogony,—*Φῖκ' ὀλοὴν τέκε, Καδμείοισιν ὅλεθρον* Theog. 326).

achieve the salvation of the city. At this juncture Œdipus arrived and solved the riddle: upon which the Sphinx immediately threw herself from the acropolis and disappeared. As a recompense for this service, Œdipus was made king of Thêbes, and married Jokasta, not aware that she was his mother.

These main tragical circumstances—that Œdipus had ignorantly killed his father and married his mother—belong to the oldest form of the legend as it stands in the *Odyssey*. The gods (it is added in that poem) quickly made the facts known to mankind. Epikasta (so Jokasta is here called) in an agony of sorrow hanged herself: Œdipus remained king of the Kadmeians, but underwent many and great miseries, such as the Erinnyses, who avenge an injured mother, inflict.¹ A passage in the *Iliad* implies that he died at Thêbes, since it mentions the funeral games which were celebrated there in honour of him. His misfortunes were recounted by Nestôr, in the old Cyprian verses, among the stories of aforetime.² A fatal curse hung both upon himself and upon his children, Eteoklês, Polynikês, Antigonê and Isménê. According to that narrative which the Attic tragedians have rendered universally current, they were his children by Jokasta, the disclosure of her true relationship to him having been very long deferred. But the ancient epic called *Œdipodia*, treading more closely in the footsteps of Homer, represented him as having after her death married a second wife, Euryganeia, by whom the four children were born to him: and the painter Onatas adopted this story in preference to that of Sophoklês.³

¹ *Odyss.* xi. 270. Odysseus, describing what he saw in the under-world, says—

Μητέρα τ' Οιδιπόδαο ίδον, καλὴν Ἐπικάστην,
*Η μέγα ἔργον ἔρεξεν ἀδρέτηο νόοιο,
Γημαένη φινεῖ ὁ δ' ὑπ πατέρο ἔξεναριξας
Γῆμεν ἄφαρ δ' ἀνάπυστα θεοὶ θέσαν αἰθρώποισι.
*Ἄλλ' ὁ μὲν ἐπ Θήβῃ πολυνάρτῳ ἀλγεα πάσχων,
Καβελῶν ἡμαστε, θεῶν ὀλοᾶς διὰ βουλάς;
*Η δ' ἐβη εἰς Αἴδαο πυλάρτῳ κρατεροῖο
*Ἀφανίη βρόχον αἰπὺν ἀρ' ὑψηλοιο μελάθρου,
*Ω ἄστει σχομένη τῷ δ' ἄλγεα κάλλιπτ ὅπιστων
Πολλὰ μαλ, ὅσσα τε μητρὸς Ἔρινες ἐκτελέουσιν.

² *Iliad*, xxiii. 680, with the scholiast who cites Hesiod. Proclus, *Argum. ad Cypria*, ap. Dünzter, *Fragm. Epic. Græc.* p. 10. *Νέστωρ δὲ ἐν παρεκβάσει διηγεῖται . . . καὶ τὰ περὶ Οἰδίπουν, &c.*

³ Pausan. ix. 5. 5. Compare the narrative from Peisander in Schol. ad *Eurip. Phœniss.* 1773; where, however, the blindness of Œdipus seems to be unconsciously interpolated out of the tragedians. In the old narrative of the Cyclic *Thêbaïs*, Œdipus does not seem to be represented as blind (Leutsch, *Thebaidis Cyclici Reliquiæ*, Götting. 1830, p. 42).

Pherekydēs (ap. Schol. Eurip. *Phœniss.* 52) tells us that Œdipus had three children by Jokasta, who were all killed by Erginus and the Minyæ (this

The disputes of Eteoklēs and Polynikēs for the throne of their father gave occasion not only to a series of tragical family incidents, but also to one of the great quasi-historical events of legendary Greece—the two sieges of Thêbes by Adrastus, king of Argos. The two ancient epic poems called the Thêbaïs and the Epigoni (if indeed both were not parts of one very comprehensive poem) detailed these events at great length, and as it appears, with distinguished poetical merit; for Pausanias pronounces the Cyclic Thêbaïs (so it was called by the subsequent critics to distinguish it from the more modern Thêbaïs of Antimachus) inferior only to the Iliad and Odyssey; and the ancient elegiac poet Kallinus treated it as an Homeric composition.¹ Of this once-valued poem we unfortunately possess nothing but a few scanty fragments. The leading points of the legend are briefly glanced at in the Iliad; but our knowledge of the details is chiefly derived from the Attic tragedians, who transformed the narratives of their predecessors at pleasure, and whose popularity constantly eclipsed and obliterated the ancient version. Antimachus of Kolophôn, contemporary with Euripidês, in his long epic, probably took no less liberties with the old narrative. His Thêbaïd never became generally popular, but it exhibited marks of study and elaboration which recommended it to the esteem of the Alexandrine critics, and probably contributed to discredit in their eyes the old cyclic poem.

The logographers, who gave a continuous history of this siege of Thêbes, had at least three pre-existing epic poems—the Thêbaïs, the Cœdipodia, and the Alkmæônis,—from which they could borrow. The subject was also handled in some of the

must refer to incidents in the old poems which we cannot now recover); then the four celebrated children by Euryganeia; lastly, that he married a third wife, Astymedusa. Apollodôrus follows the narrative of the tragedians, but alludes to the different version about Euryganeia,—*εἰσὶ δὲ οἱ φασιν*, &c. (iii. 5, 8).

Hellenikus (ap. Schol. Eur. Phœniss. 50) mentioned the self-inflicted blindness of Cœdipus; but it seems doubtful whether this circumstance was included in the narrative of Pherekydês.

¹ Pausan. ix. 9, 3. Ἐποιήθη δὲ ἐς τὸν πόλεμον τοῦτον καὶ ἔπη, Θηβαῖς· τὰ δὲ ἔπη ταῦτα Καλλίνος, ἀφικόμενος αὐτῶν ἐς μνήμην, ἔφησεν "Ομηρον τὸν ποιήσαντα είναι. Καλλίνφ δὲ πολλοί τε καὶ ἄξιοι λόγου κατὰ ταῦτα ἔγνωσαν· ἔγώ δὲ τὴν ποίησιν ταῦτην μετά γε Ἰλιάδα καὶ τὰ ἔπη τὰ ἐς Ὀδυσσέα ἐπαινῶ μάλιστα. The name in the text of Pausanias stands Καλλίνος, an unknown person: most of the critics recognise the propriety of substituting Καλλίνφ, and Leutsch and Welcker have given very sufficient reasons for doing so.

The Ἀμφίδρεω ἔξελαστα ἐς Θῆβας, alluded to in the pseudo-Herodotean life of Homer, seems to be the description of a special passage in this Thêbaïs.

Hesiodic poems, but we do not know to what extent.¹ The Thêbaïs was composed more in honour of Argos than of Thêbes, as the first line of it, one of the few fragments still preserved, betokens.²

SIEGES OF THEBES

The legend, about to recount fraternal dissension of the most implacable kind, comprehending in its results not only the immediate relations of the infuriated brothers, but many chosen companions of the heroic race along with them, takes its start from the paternal curse of Œdipus, which overhangs and determines all the gloomy sequel.

Œdipus, though king of Thêbes and father of four children by Euryganeia (according to the Œdipodia), has become the devoted victim of the Erinnyses, in consequence of the self-inflicted death of his mother, which he had unconsciously caused, as well as of his unintentional parricide. Though he had long forsaken the use of all the ornaments and luxuries which his father had inherited from his kingly progenitors, yet when through age he had come to be dependent upon his two sons, Polynikês one day broke through this interdict, and set before him the silver table and the splendid wine-cup of Kadmus, which Laius had always been accustomed to employ. The old king had no sooner seen these precious appendages of the regal life of his father, than his mind was overrun by a calamitous frenzy, and he imprecated terrible curses on his sons, predicting that there would be bitter and endless warfare between them. The goddess Erinnys heard and heeded him; and he repeated the curse again on another occasion, when his sons, who had always been accustomed to send to him the shoulder of the victims sacrificed on the altar, caused the buttock to be served to him in place of it.³ He resented this as an insult,

¹ Hesiod, ap. Schol. Iliad. xxiii. 680, which passage does not seem to me so much at variance with the incidents stated in other poets as Leutsch imagines.

² Ἀργος δεῖδε, θεὰ, πολυδίψιον, ξυθεν ἄνακτες (see Leutsch, ib. c. 4, p. 29).

³ Fragm. of the Thêbaïs, ap. Athenæ. xii. p. 465. δτι αὐτῷ παρέθηκαν ἐκπώματα δι ἀπηγορεύκει, λέγων οὕτως·

Αὐτάρ διδούσεις ἥρως ξανθὸς Πολυνείκης
Πρώτα μὲν Οἰδίποδι καλὴν παρέθηκε τράπεζαν
'Αργυρέην Κάδμοιο θεόφρονος' αὐτάρ ἐπειτα
Χρύσεον ἐμπλήσαν καλὸν δέπας ηδέος οίνου·
Αὐτάρ οὐ' ὡς φράσθη παρακείμενα πατρὸς ἔοι

and prayed the gods that they might perish each by the hand of the other. Throughout the tragedians as well as in the old epic, the paternal curse, springing immediately from the misguided Œdipus himself, but remotely from the parricide and incest with which he has tainted his breed, is seen to domineer over the course of events—the Erinnys who executes that curse being the irresistible, though concealed, agent. Æschylus not only preserves the fatal efficiency of the paternal curse, but even briefly glances at the causes assigned for it in the Thébaïs, without superadding any new motives. In the judgement of Sophoklēs, or of his audience, the conception of a father cursing his sons upon such apparently trifling grounds was odious; and that great poet introduced many aggravating circumstances, describing the old blind father as having been barbarously turned out of doors by his sons to wander abroad in exile and poverty. Though by this change he rendered his poem more coherent and self-justifying, yet he departed from the spirit of the old legend, according to which Œdipus has contracted by his unconscious misdeeds an incurable taint destined to pass onward to his progeny. His mind is alienated, and he curses them, not because he has suffered seriously by their guilt, but because he is made the blind instrument of an avenging Erinnys for the ruin of the house of Laius.¹

Τύχεντα γέρα, μέγα οἱ κακὸν ἔμπεσε θυμῷ.
Αἴψα δὲ παισιν τοῖσι μετ' ἀμφοτέροισιν ἐπαρὰς
'Αργαλέας πράτος θένος δὲ οὐ λάινθαν 'Εριννυν·
'Ος οὐ οἱ πατρῷα γένει φιλότητι δάσαιντα,
Εἰεν δὲ ἀμφοτέροις αἰεὶ πόλεμοί τε μάχαι τε.

See Leutsch, Thebaid. Cycl. Reliq. p. 38.

The other fragment from the same Thébaïs is cited by the Schol. ad Soph. Œdip. Colon. 1378—

Ίσχιον ὡς ἐνόρσε, χαμαὶ βάλεν, κίπε τε μῦθον.
*Ω μοι ἔγω, παιδές μοι ὄνειδειόντες ἐπεμψαν.
Εῦκτο Διτίς βασιλῆς καὶ ὄλλοις ἀθανάτοισι,
Χεροῖν ὑπὸ ἀλλήλων καταβήμεναι Αἴδος εἰσω.

Γὰ δὲ παραπλήσια τῷ ἐποιώ καὶ Αἰσχύλος ἐν τοῖς Ἐπτὰ ἐπὶ Θήβας. In spite of the protest of Schutz, in his note, I think that the scholiast has understood the words *ἐπίκοτος τροφᾶς* (Sept. ad Theb. 787) in their plain and just meaning.

¹ The curses of Œdipus are very frequently and emphatically dwelt upon both by Æschylus and Sophoklēs (Sept. ad Theb. 70–586, 655–697, &c.; Œdip. Colon. 1293–1378). The former continues the same point of view as the Thébaïs, when he mentions—

Τὰς περιθύμους
Κατάρας βλαψίφρονος Οἰδιπόδα (727):

ορ, λόγου τ' ἄνοια καὶ φρενῶν 'Εριννύς (Soph. Antig. 584).

The Scholiast on Sophoklēs (Œd. Col. 1378) treats the cause assigned by the ancient Thébaïs for the curse vented by Œdipus as trivial and ludicrous.

After the death of Oedipus and the celebration of his funeral games, at which, amongst others, Argeia, daughter of Adrastus (afterwards the wife of Polynikēs), was present,¹ his two sons soon quarrelled respecting the succession. The circumstances are differently related; but it appears that, according to the original narrative, the wrong and injustice was on the side of Polynikēs; who, however, was obliged to leave Thēbes and to seek shelter with Adrastus, king of Argos. Here he met Tydeus, a fugitive, at the same time, from Ætolia: it was dark when they arrived, and a broil ensued between the two exiles, but Adrastus came out and parted them. He had been enjoined by an oracle to give his two daughters in marriage to a lion and a boar, and he thought that this occasion had now arrived, inasmuch as one of the combatants carried on his shield a lion, the other a boar. He accordingly gave Deipylē in marriage to Tydeus, and Argeia to Polynikēs: moreover he resolved to restore by armed assistance both his sons-in-law to their respective countries.²

On proposing the expedition to the Argeian chiefs around him, he found most of them willing auxiliaries; but Amphiaraüs—formerly his bitter opponent, though now reconciled to him, and husband of his sister Eriphylē—strongly opposed him,³ denouncing the enterprise as unjust and contrary to the will of the gods. Again, being of a prophetic stock, descended from Melampus, he foretold the certain death both of himself and of the principal leaders, should they involve themselves as accomplices in the mad violence of Tydeus, or the criminal ambition of Polynikēs. Amphiaraüs, already distinguished both in the Kalydonian boar-hunt and in the funeral games of Pelias, was in the Thēban war the most conspicuous of all the heroes, and absolutely indispensable to its success. But his reluctance to engage in it was invincible, nor was it possible to prevail

The Ægeids at Sparta, who traced their descent to Kadmus, suffered from terrible maladies which destroyed the lives of their children; an oracle directed them to appease the Erinnies of Laius and Oedipus by erecting a temple, upon which the maladies speedily ceased (Herodot. iv.).

¹ Hesiod, ap. Schol. Iliad. xxiii. 680.

² Apollodōr. iii. 5, 9; Hygin. f. 69; Æschyl. Sept. ad Theb. 573. Hyginus says that Polynikēs came clothed in the skin of a lion, and Tydeus in that of a boar; perhaps after Antimachus, who said that Tydeus had been brought up by swineherds (Antimach. Fragn. 27, ed. Dūntzer; ap. Schol. Iliad. iv. 400). Very probably, however, the old Thēbals compared Tydeus and Polynikēs to a lion and a boar, on account of their courage and fierceness; a simile quite in the Homeric character. Mnaseas gave the words of the oracle (ap. Schol. Eurip. Phœniss. 411).

³ See Pindar, Nem. ix. 30, with the instructive Scholium.

upon him except through the influence of his wife Eriphylē. Polynikēs, having brought with him from Thêbes the splendid robe and necklace given by the gods to Harmonia on her marriage with Kadmus, offered it as a bribe to Eriphylē, on condition that she would influence the determination of Amphiaräus. The sordid wife, seduced by so matchless a present, betrayed the lurking place of her husband, and involved him in the fatal expedition.¹ Amphiaräus, reluctantly dragged forth, and foreknowing the disastrous issue of the expedition both to himself and to his associates, addressed his last injunctions, at the moment of mounting his chariot, to his sons Alkmæôn and Amphilochus, commanding Alkmæôn to avenge his approaching death by killing the venal Eriphylē, and by undertaking a second expedition against Thêbes.

The Attic dramatists describe this expedition as having been conducted by seven chiefs, one to each of the seven celebrated gates of Thêbes. But the Cyclic Thêbaïs gave to it a much more comprehensive character, mentioning auxiliaries from Arcadia, Messênê, and various parts of Peloponnêsus:² and the application of Tydeus and Polynikēs at Mykénæ in the course of their circuit made to collect allies, is mentioned in the Iliad. They were well received at Mykénæ; but the warning signals given by the gods were so terrible that no Mykenæan could venture to accompany them.³ The seven principal chiefs however were Adrastus, Amphiaräus, Kapaneus, Hippomedôn, Parthenopæus, Tydeus and Polynikēs.⁴

The Kadmeians, assisted by their allies the Phôkians and the Phlegyæ, marched out to resist the invaders, and fought a battle near the Ismêian hill, in which they were defeated and forced to retire within the walls. The prophet Teiresias acquainted them that if Mencekeus, son of Krêôn, would offer himself as a victim to Arês, victory would be assured to Thêbes. The generous youth, as soon as he learnt that his

¹ Apollodôr. iii. 6, 2. The treachery of "the hateful Eriphylē" is noticed in the Odyssey, xi. 327: Odysseus sees her in the under-world along with the many wives and daughters of the heroes.

² Pausan. ii. 20, 4; ix. 9, 1. His testimony to this, as he had read and admired the Cyclic Thêbaïs, seems quite sufficient, in spite of the opinion of Welcker to the contrary (Æschylische Trilogie, p. 375).

³ Iliad, iv. 376.

⁴ There are differences in respect to the names of the seven; Æschylus (Sept. ad Theb. 461) leaves out Adrastus as one of the seven, and includes Eteoklus instead of him; others left out Tydeus and Polynikēs, and inserted Eteoklus and Mekisteus (Apollodôr. iii. 6, 3). Antimachus, in his poetical *Thêbaïs*, called Parthenopæus an Argeian, not an Arcadian (Schol. ad Æschyl. Sept. ad Theb. 532).

life was to be the price of safety to his country, went and slew himself before the gates. The heroes along with Adrastus now commenced a vigorous attack upon the town, each of the seven selecting one of the gates to assault. The contest was long and strenuously maintained ; but the devotion of Mencekeus had procured for the Thēbans the protection of the gods. Parthenopæus was killed with a stone by Periklymenus ; and when the furious Kapaneus, having planted a scaling-ladder, had mounted the walls, he was smitten by a thunderbolt from Zeus, and cast down dead upon the earth. This event struck terror into the Argeians, and Adrastus called back his troops from the attack. The Thēbans now sallied forth to pursue them, when Eteoklēs, arresting the battle, proposed to decide the controversy by single combat with his brother. The challenge, eagerly accepted by Polynikēs, was agreed to by Adrastus : a single combat ensued between the two brothers, in which both were exasperated to fury, and both ultimately slain by each other's hand. This equal termination left the result of the general contest still undetermined, and the bulk of the two armies renewed the fight. In the sanguinary struggle which ensued, the sons of Astakus on the Thēban side displayed the most conspicuous and successful valour. One of them,¹ Melanippus, mortally wounded Tydeus—while two others, Leades and Amphidikus, killed Eteoklus and Hippomedōn. Amphiaräus avenged Tydeus by killing Melanippus ; but unable to arrest the rout of the army, he fled with the rest, closely pursued by Periklymenus. The latter was about to pierce him with his spear, when the beneficence of Zeus rescued him from this disgrace—miraculously opening the earth under him, so that Amphiaräus with his chariot and horses was received unscathed into her bosom.² The exact

¹ The story recounted that the head of Melanippus was brought to Tydeus as he was about to expire of his wound, and that he gnawed it with his teeth, a story touched upon by Sophoklēs (apud Herodian. in Rhetor. Græc. t. viii. p. 601, Walz.).

The lyric poet Bacchylidēs (ap. Schol. Aristoph. *Aves*, 1535) seems to have handled the story even earlier than Sophoklēs.

We find the same allegation embodied in charges against real historical men : the invective of Montanus against Aquilius Regulus, at the beginning of the reign of Vespasian, affirmed, “datam interfectori Pisonis pecuniam a Regulo, appetitumque morsu Pisonis caput” (Tacit. *Hist.* iv. 42).

² *Apollodōr.* iii. 6, 8. *Pindar, Olymp.* vi. 11 ; *Mem.* ix. 13-27. *Pausan.* ix. 8, 2 ; 18, 2-4.

Euripidēs, in the *Phœnissæ* (1122 *seqq.*), describes the battle generally ; see also *Æsch.* S. Th. 392. It appears by Pausanias that the Thēbans had poems or legends of their own, relative to this war : they dissented in various points from the Cyclic Thēbaïs (ix. 18, 4). The Thēbaïs said that

spot where this memorable incident happened was indicated by a sepulchral building, and shown by the Thēbans down to the days of Pausanias—its sanctity being attested by the fact, that no animal would consent to touch the herbage which grew within the sacred inclosure. Amphiaräus, rendered immortal by Zeus, was worshipped as a god at Argos, at Thēbes, and at Orōpus—and for many centuries gave answers at his oracle to the questions of the pious applicant.¹

Adrastus, thus deprived of the prophet and warrior whom he regarded as “the eye of his army,” and having seen the other chiefs killed in the disastrous fight, was forced to take flight singly, and was preserved by the matchless swiftness of his horse Areiōn, the offspring of Poseidōn. He reached Argos on his return, bringing with him nothing except “his garment of woe and his black-maned steed.”²

Periklymenus had killed Parthenopæus: the Thēbans assigned this exploit to Asphodikus, a warrior not commemorated by any of the poets known to us.

The village of Harma, between Tanagra and Mykalēssus, was affirmed by some to have been the spot where Amphiaräus closed his life (Strabo, ix. p. 404); Sophoklēs placed the scene at the Amphiaræum near Orōpus (ap. Strabon. ix. p. 399).

¹ Pindar, Olymp. vi. 16. ‘Ἐπτὰ δ’ ἔπειτα πυρῶν νεκρῶν τελεσθέντων Ταλαιονίδας Εἶπεν ἐν Θήβαισι τοιοῦτόν τι ἔπος· Ποθέω στρατιᾶς ὀφθαλμὸν ἐμᾶς Ἀμφιτέρον, μάντιν τ’ ἀγαθὸν καὶ δουρὶ μάχεσθαι.

The scholiast affirms that these last expressions are borrowed by Pindar from the Cyclic Thēbais.

The temple of Amphiaräus (Pausan. ii. 23, 2), his oracle, seems to have been equal in estimation to every other except that of Delphi (Herodot. i. 52; Pausan. i. 34; Cicero, Divin. i. 40). Croesus sent a rich present to Amphiaräus, πυθόμενος αὐτοῦ τὴν τε ἀρετὴν καὶ τὴν πάθην (Herod. I. c.); a striking proof how these interesting legends were recounted and believed as genuine historical facts. Other adventures of Amphiaräus in the expedition against Thēbes were commemorated in the carvings on the Thronus at Amyklæ (Pausan. iii. 18, 4).

Æschylus (Sept. Theb. 611) seems to enter into the Thēban view, doubtless highly respectful towards Amphiaräus, when he places in the mouth of the Kadmeian king Eteoklēs such high encomiums on Amphiaräus, and so marked a contrast with the other chiefs from Argos.

² Pausan. viii. 25, 5, from the Cyclic Thēbais, Εἴματα λυγρὰ φέρων σὺν Ἀπελονὶ κνανοχαίτῃ; also Apollodōr. iii. 6, 8.

The celebrity of the horse Areiōn was extolled in the Iliad (xxiii. 346), in the Cyclic Thēbais, and also in the Thēbais of Antimachus (Pausan. I. c.): by the Arcadians of Thelpusia he was said to be the offspring of Dēmêtēr by Poseidōn,—he, and a daughter whose name Pausanias will not communicate, except to the initiated (*ἥς τὸ δυομά ἐστι ἀτελέστους λέγειν οὐ νομίζονται*, I. c.). A different story is in the Schol. Iliad. xxiii. 346; and in Antimachus, who affirmed that “Gaea herself had produced him as a wonder to mortal men” (see Antimach. Frag. 16, p. 102; Epic. Græc. Frag. ed. Dūntzter).

Kreôn, father of the heroic youth Menœkeus, succeeding to the administration of Thêbes after the death of the two hostile brothers and the repulse of Adrastus, caused Eteoklês to be buried with distinguished honour, but cast out ignominiously the body of Polynikês as a traitor to his country, forbidding every one on pain of death to consign it to the tomb. He likewise refused permission to Adrastus to inter the bodies of his fallen comrades. This proceeding, so offensive to Grecian feeling, gave rise to two farther tales; one of them at least of the highest pathos and interest. Antigonê, the sister of Polynikês, heard with indignation the revolting edict consigning her brother's body to the dogs and vultures, and depriving it of those rites which were considered essential to the repose of the dead. Unmoved by the dissuading counsel of an affectionate but timid sister, and unable to procure assistance, she determined to brave the hazard, and to bury the body with her own hands. She was detected in the act; and Kreôn, though forewarned by Teiresias of the consequences, gave orders that she should be buried alive, as having deliberately set at naught the solemn edict of the city. His son Hæmôn, to whom she was engaged to be married, in vain interceded for her life. In an agony of despair he slew himself in the sepulchre to which the living Antigonê had been consigned; and his mother Eurydikê, the wife of Kreôn, inconsolable for his death, perished by her own hand. And thus the new light which seemed to be springing up over the last remaining scion of the devoted family of Cœdipus, is extinguished amidst gloom and horrors—which overshadowed also the house and dynasty of Kreôn.¹

The other tale stands more apart from the original legend, and seems to have had its origin in the patriotic pride of the Athenians. Adrastus, unable to obtain permission from the Thêbans to inter the fallen chieftains, presented himself in suppliant guise, accompanied by their disconsolate mothers, to Thêseus at Eleusis. He implored the Athenian warrior to extort from the perverse Thêbans that last melancholy privilege which no decent or pious Greeks ever thought of withholding,

¹ Sophokl. Antigon. 581. Νῦν γὰρ ἐσχάτας ὑπὲρ Πίγας ἐτέτατο φάος ἐν Οἰδίποιο δόμοις, &c.

The pathetic tale here briefly recounted forms the subject of this beautiful tragedy of Sophoklês, the argument of which is supposed by Boeckh to have been borrowed in its primary rudiments from the Cyclic Thêbais or the Cœdipodia (Boeckh, Dissertation appended to his translation of the Antigonê, c. x. p. 146): see Apollodôr. iii. 7, 1.

Æschylus also touches upon the heroism of Antigonê (Sep. Theb. 984).

and thus to stand forth as the champion of Grecian public morality in one of its most essential points, not less than of the rights of the subterranean gods. The Thébans obstinately persisting in their refusal, Théseus undertook an expedition against their city, vanquished them in the field, and compelled them by force of arms to permit the sepulture of their fallen enemies. This chivalrous interposition, celebrated in one of the preserved dramas of Euripidés, formed a subject of glorious recollection to the Athenians throughout the historical age. Their orators dwelt upon it in terms of animated panegyric; and it seems to have been accepted as a real fact of the past time, with not less implicit conviction than the battle of Marathôn.¹ But the Thébans, though equally persuaded of the truth of the main story, dissented from the Athenian version of it, maintaining that they had given up the bodies for sepulture voluntarily and of their own accord. The tomb of the chieftains was shown near Eleusis even in the days of Pausanias.²

The defeat of the seven chiefs before Thébes was amply avenged by their sons, again under the guidance of Adrastus:—Ægialeus son of Adrastus, Thersander son of Polynikēs, Alkmæôn and Amphilochus, sons of Amphiaräus, Diomêtês son of Tydeus, Sthenelus son of Kapaneus, Promachus son of Parthenopaeus, and Euryalus son of Mekistheus, joined in this expedition. Though all these youthful warriors, called the Epigoni, took part in the expedition, the grand and prominent place appears to have been occupied by Alkmæôn, son of Amphiaräus. Assistance was given to them from Corinth and Megara, as well as from Messénê and Arcadia; while Zeus manifested his favourable dispositions by signals not to be mistaken.³ At the river Glisas the Epigoni were met by the Thébans in arms, and a battle took place in which the latter were completely defeated. Laodamas, son of Eteoklês, killed Ægialeus, son of Adrastus; but he and his army were routed and driven within the walls by the valour and energy of

¹ Apollodôr. iii. 7, 1; Eurip. Supp. *passim*; Herodot. ix. 27; Plato, Menexen. c. 9; Lysias, Epitaph. c. 4; Isokrat. Orat. Panegyr. p. 196, Auger.

² Pausan. i. 39, 2.

³ Homer, Iliad, iv. 406. Sthenelus, the companion of Diomêtês and one of the Epigoni, says to Agamemnôn—

‘Ημεῖς τοι πατέρων μέγ’ ἀμείνονες εὐχομεθ’ εἶναι.
‘Ημεῖς καὶ Θήβης ἔδος εἰλομένι ἐπταπύλοιο,
Παυρότερον λαὸν ἀγαγόνθ’ ὑπὸ τείχος Ἀρειον,
Πειθόμενοι τεράσσοι θεῶν καὶ Σηνὸς ἀρωγῇ.
Ἄντοι δὲ σφετέρησσιν ἀτασθαλίησιν ὅλοντο.’

Alkmæôn. The defeated Kadmeians consulted the prophet Teiresias, who informed them that the gods had declared for their enemies, and that there was no longer any hope of successful resistance. By his advice they sent a herald to the assailants offering to surrender the town, while they themselves conveyed away their wives and children, and fled under the command of Laodamas to the Illyrians,¹ upon which the Epigoni entered Thêbes, and established Thersander, son of Polynikês, on the throne.

Adrastus, who in the former expedition had been the single survivor amongst so many fallen companions, now found himself the only exception to the general triumph and joy of the conquerors: he had lost his son Ægialeus, and the violent sorrow arising from the event prematurely cut short his life. His soft voice and persuasive eloquence were proverbial in the ancient epic.² He was worshipped as a hero both at Argos and at Sikyôn, but with especial solemnity in the last-mentioned place, where his Herôum stood in the public agora, and where his exploits as well as his sufferings were celebrated periodically in lyric tragedies. Melanippus, son of Astakus, the brave defender of Thêbes, who had slain both Tydeus and Mekistheus, was worshipped with no less solemnity by the Thêbans.³ The enmity of these two heroes rendered it impossible for both of them to be worshipped close upon the same spot. Accordingly it came to pass during the historical period, shortly after the time of the Solonian legislation at Athens, that Kleisthenês, despot of Sikyôn, wishing to banish the hero Adrastus and abolish the religious solemnities celebrated in honour of the latter by the Sikyonians, first applied to the Delphian oracle for permission to carry this banishment into effect directly and forcibly. That permission being refused, he next sent to Thêbes an intimation that he was anxious to introduce their hero Melanippus into Sikyôn. The Thêbans willingly consented, and he assigned to the new hero a consecrated spot in the strongest and most commanding portion of the Sikyonian prytaneium. He did this (says the historian) “knowing that

¹ Apollodôr. iii. 7, 4. Herodot. v. 57–61. Pausan. ix. 5, 7; 9, 2. Diodôr. iv. 65–66.

Pindar represents Adrastus as concerned in the second expedition against Thêbes (Pyth. viii. 40–58).

² Γλῶσσαν τ' Ἀδράστου μειλιχύγρυν ἔχοι (Tyrtæus, Eleg. 9, 7, Schneidewin); compare Plato, Phædr. c. 118. “Adrasti pallentis imago” meets the eye of Æneas in the under-world (Æneid, vi. 480).

³ About Melanippus, see Pindar, Nem. x. 36. His sepulchre was shown near the Proætid gates of Thêbes (Pausan. ix. 18, 1).

Adrastus would forthwith go away of his own accord ; since Melanippus was of all persons the most odious to him, as having slain both his son-in-law and his brother." Kleisthenēs moreover diverted the festivals and sacrifices which had been offered to Adrastus, to the newly-established hero Melanippus ; and the lyric tragedies from the worship of Adrastus to that of Dionysus. But his dynasty did not long continue after his decease, and the Sikyonians then re-established their ancient solemnities.¹

Near the Prætid gate of Thêbes were seen the tombs of two combatants who had hated each other during life even more than Adrastus and Melanippus—the two brothers Eteoklês and Polynikês. Even as heroes and objects of worship, they still continued to manifest their inextinguishable hostility : those who offered sacrifices to them observed that the flame and the smoke from the two adjoining altars abhorred all communion, and flew off in directions exactly opposite. The Thêban exēgetes assured Pausanias of this fact. And though he did not himself witness it, yet having seen with his own eyes a miracle not very dissimilar at Pioniæ in Mysia, he had no difficulty in crediting their assertion.²

Amphiaräus, when forced into the first attack of Thêbes—against his own foreknowledge and against the warnings of the gods—had enjoined his sons Alkmaeon and Amphirochus not only to avenge his death upon the Thêbans, but also to punish the treachery of their mother, " Eriphylê, the destroyer of her

¹ This very curious and illustrative story is contained in Herodot. v. 67. "Ἐπεὶ δὲ ὁ θεὸς τοῦτο οὐ παρεδίδου, ἀπελθὼν ὅπιστα (Kleisthenēs, returning from Delphi) ἐφρόντιζε μηχανὴν τὴν αὐτὸν δός "Αδρηστος ἀπαλλάξεται. 'Ως δέ οἱ ἔξευρησθαι ἐδόκει, πέμψας ἐς Θήβας τὰς Βοιωτίας, ἔφη θέλειν ἐπαγαγέσθαι Μελάνιππον τὸν Ἀστακοῦ οἱ δὲ Θηβαῖοι ἔδοσαν. 'Ἐπηγάγετο δὲ τὸν Μελάνιππον δὲ Κλεισθένης, καὶ γὰρ τοῦτο δεῖ ἀπηγάγασθαι, ὡς ἔχθιστον ἐόντα 'Αδρηστον δι τὸν τε ἀδελφεὸν Μηκιστέα ἀκεκτόνεε, καὶ τὸν γαμβρὸν Τυδέα.

The Sikyonians (Herodotus says) τὰ τε δὴ ἄλλα ἔτιμων τὸν "Αδρηστον, καὶ πρὸς, τὰ πάθεα αὐτοῦ τραγικοῖσι χοροῖσι ἐγέραιρον" τὸν μὲν Διόνυσον οὐ τιμέντες, τὸν δὲ "Αδρηστον".

Adrastus was worshipped as a hero at Megara as well as at Sikyôn : the Megarians affirmed that he had died there on his way back from Thêbes (Pausan. i. 43, 1 ; Dieuchidas, ap. Schol. ad Pindar. Nem. ix. 31). His house at Argos was still shown when Pausanias visited the town (ii. 23, 2).

² Pausan. ix. 18. 3. Τὰ ἐπ' αὐτοῖς δρώμενα οὐ θεασάμενος πιστὰ δημως ὑπεληφα εἶναι. Compare Hygin. f. 68.

"Et nova fraterno veniet concordia fumo,
Quem vetus accensâ separat ira pyrâ."
(Ovid, Ibis, 35.)

husband.”¹ In obedience to this command, and having obtained the sanction of the Delphian oracle, Alkmæôn slew his mother;² but the awful Erinnys, the avenger of matricide, inflicted on him a long and terrible punishment, depriving him of his reason, and chasing him about from place to place without the possibility of repose or peace of mind. He craved protection and cure from the god at Delphi, who required him to dedicate at the temple, as an offering, the precious necklace of Kadmus, that irresistible bribe which had originally corrupted Eriphylê.³ He farther intimated to the unhappy sufferer, that though the whole earth was tainted with his crime, and had become uninhabitable for him, yet there was a spot of ground which was not under the eye of the sun at the time when the matricide was committed, and where therefore Alkmæôn yet might find a tranquil shelter. The promise was realised at the mouth of the river Achelous, whose turbid stream was perpetually depositing new earth and forming additional islands. Upon one of these, near Æniadæ, Alkmæôn settled, permanently and in peace: he became the primitive hero of Akarnania, to which his son Akarnan gave name.⁴ The necklace was found among the treasures of Delphi (together with that which had been given by Aphroditê

¹ Ἀνδροδάμαντ' Ἐριφύλην (Pindar, Nem. ix. 16). A poem *Eriphylê* was included among the mythical compositions of Stesichorus: he mentioned in it that Asklepius had restored Kapaneus to life, and that he was for that reason struck dead by thunder from Zeus (Stesichor. Fragn. Kleine, 18, p. 74). Two tragedies of Sophoklês once existed, *Epigoni* and *Alkmæôn* (Welcker, Griechisch. Tragöd. i. p. 269): a few fragments also remain of the Latin *Epigoni* and *Alphesibœa* of Attius: Ennius and Attius both composed or translated from the Greek a Latin *Alkmæôn* (Poet. Scenic. Latin. ed. Both, pp. 33, 164, 198).

² Hyginus gives the fable briefly (f. 73; see also Asklepiadês, ap. Schol. Odys. xi. 326). In like manner, in the case of the matricide of Orestês, Apollo not only sanctions, but enjoins the deed; but his protection against the avenging Erinnys is very tardy, not taking effect until after Orestês had been long persecuted and tormented by them (see Aeschyl. Eumen. 76, 197, 462).

In the *Alkmæôn* of the later tragic writer Theodektês, a distinction was drawn: the gods had decreed that Eriphylê should die, but not that Alkmæôn should kill her (Aristot. Rhetoric. ii. 24). Astydamas altered the story still more in his tragedy, and introduced Alkmæôn as killing his mother ignorantly and without being aware who she was (Aristot. Poetic. c. 27). The murder of Eriphylê by her son was one of the παρειλημμένοι μῦθοι which could not be departed from; but interpretations and qualifications were resorted to, in order to prevent it from shocking the softened feelings of the spectators: see the criticism of Aristotle on the *Alkmæôn* of Euripidês (Ethic. Nicom. iii. 1, 8).

³ Ephorus ap. Athenæ. vi. p. 232.

⁴ Thucyd. ii. 68-102.

to Helen), by the Phôkian plunderers who stripped the temple in the time of Philip of Macedôn. The Phôkian women quarrelled about these valuable ornaments. We are told that the necklace of Eriphylê was allotted to a woman of gloomy and malignant disposition, who ended by putting her husband to death ; that of Helen to a beautiful but volatile wife, who abandoned her husband from preference for a young Epirot.¹

There were several other legends respecting the distracted Alkmæôn, either appropriated or invented by the Attic tragedians. He went to Phêgeus, king of Psôphis in Arcadia, whose daughter Arsinoê he married, giving as a nuptial present the necklace of Eriphylê. Being however unable to remain there, in consequence of the unremitting persecutions of the maternal Erinnys, he sought shelter at the residence of king Achelous, whose daughter Kallirhoê he made his wife, and on whose soil he obtained repose.² But Kallirhoê would not be satisfied without the possession of the necklace of Eriphylê, and Alkmæôn went back to Psôphis to fetch it, where Phêgeus and his sons slew him. He had left twin sons, infants, with Kallirhoê, who prayed fervently to Zeus that they might be preternaturally invested with immediate manhood, in order to revenge the murder of their father. Her prayer was granted, and her sons Amphoterus and Akarnan, having instantaneously sprung up to manhood, proceeded into Arcadia, slew the murderers of their father, and brought away the necklace of Eriphylê, which they carried to Delphi.³

¹ Athenæ, *l. c.*

² Apollodôr. iii. 7, 5-6 : Pausan. viii. 24, 4. These two authors have preserved the story of the Akarnanians and the old form of the legend, representing Alkmæôn as having found shelter at the abode of the person or king Achelous, and married his daughter : Thucydidês omits the *personality* of Achelous, and merely announces the wanderer as having settled on certain new islands deposited by the river.

I may remark that this is a singularly happy adaptation of a legend to an existing topographical fact. Generally speaking, before any such adaptation can be rendered plausible, the legend is of necessity much transformed ; here it is taken exactly as it stands, and still fits on with great precision.

Ephorus recounted the whole sequence of events as so much political history, divesting it altogether of the legendary character. Alkmæôn and Diomêdês, after having taken Thêbes with the other Epigoni, jointly undertook an expedition into Ætôlia and Akarnania : they first punished the enemies of the old Cœneus, grandfather of Diomêdês, and established the latter as king in Kalydôn ; next they conquered Akarnania for Alkmæôn. Alkmæôn, though invited by Agamemnôn to join in the Trojan war, would not consent to do so (Ephor. ap. Strabo. vii. p. 326 ; x. p. 462).

³ Apollodôr. iii. 7, 7 ; Pausan. viii. 24, 3-4. His remarks upon the mischievous longing of Kallirhoê for the necklace are curious : he ushers them in by saying, that “many men, and still more women, are given to

Euripidēs deviated still more widely from the ancient epic, by making Alkmæōn the husband of Mantō, daughter of Teiresias, and the father of Amphilochus. According to the Cyclic Thēbaïs, Mantō was consigned by the victorious Epigoni as a special offering to the Delphian god; and Amphilochus was son of Amphiaräus, not son of Alkmæōn.¹ He was the eponymous hero of the town called the Amphilochian Argos, in Akarnania, on the shore of the Gulf of Ambrakia. Thucydidēs tells us that he went thither on his return from the Trojan war, being dissatisfied with the state of affairs which he found at the Peloponnēsian Argos.² The Akarnanians were remarkable for the numerous prophets which they supplied to the rest of Greece: their heroes were naturally drawn from the great prophetic race of the Melampodids.

Thus ends the legend of the two sieges of Thēbes; the greatest event, except the siege of Troy, in the ancient epic; the greatest enterprise of war, between Greeks and Greeks, during the time of those who are called the Heroes.

CHAPTER XV

LEGEND OF TROY

WE now arrive at the capital and culminating point of the Grecian epic,—the two sieges and capture of Troy, with the destinies of the dispersed heroes, Trojan as well as Grecian, after the second and most celebrated capture and destruction of the city.

It would require a large volume to convey any tolerable idea fall into absurd desires," &c. He recounts it with all the *bonne foi* which belongs to the most assured matter of fact.

A short allusion is in Ovid's Metamorphoses (ix. 412).

¹ Thēbaïd, Cy. Reliqu. p. 70, Leutsch; Schol. Apollōn. Rhod. i. 408. The following lines cited in Athenaeus (vii. p. 317) are supposed by Boeckh, with probable reason, to be taken from the Cyclic Thēbaïs; a portion of the advice of Amphiaräus to his sons at the time of setting out on his last expedition—

Πουλύποδός μοι, τέκνον, ἔχων νόον, Ἀμφίλοχ' ἥρως,
Τοῖσιν ἐφαρμόσου, τῶν ἀν κατὰ δῆμον ἵκηαι.

There were two tragedies composed by Euripidēs, under the title of 'Αλκμαῖων, δ διὰ Ψωφῖδος, and 'Αλκμαῖων, δ διὰ Κορίνθου (Dindorf, Fragm. Eurip. p. 77).

² Apollodōr. iii. 7, 7; Thucyd. ii. 68.

of the vast extent and expansion of this interesting fable, ^{first} handled by so many poets, epic, lyric, and tragic, with their endless additions, transformations and contradictions,—then purged and recast by historical inquirers, who, under colour of setting aside the exaggerations of the poets, introduced a new vein of prosaic invention,—lastly, moralised and allegorised by philosophers. In the present brief outline of the general field of Grecian legend, or of that which the Greeks believed to be their antiquities, the Trojan war can be regarded as only one among a large number of incidents upon which Hekatæus and Herodotus looked back as constituting their fore-time. Taken as a special legendary event, it is indeed of wider and larger interest than any other, but it is a mistake to single it out from the rest as if it rested upon a different and more trustworthy basis. I must therefore confine myself to an abridged narrative of the current and leading facts ; and amidst the numerous contradictory statements which are to be found respecting every one of them, I know no better ground of preference than comparative antiquity, though even the oldest tales which we possess—those contained in the Iliad—evidently presuppose others of prior date.

The primitive ancestor of the Trojan line of kings is Dardanus, son of Zeus, founder and eponymus of Dardania :¹ in the account of later authors, Dardanus was called the son of Zeus by Elektra, daughter of Atlas, and was farther said to have come from Samothrace, or from Arcadia, or from Italy ;² but of this Homer mentions nothing. The first Dardanian town founded by him was in a lofty position on the descent of Mount Ida ; for he was not yet strong enough to establish himself on the plain. But his son Erichthonius, by the favour of Zeus, became the wealthiest of mankind. His flocks and herds having multiplied, he had in his pastures three thousand mares, the offspring of some of whom, by Boreas, produced horses of preternatural swiftness. Trôs, the son of Erichthonius, and the eponym of the Trojans, had three sons—Ilus, Assaracus, and the beautiful Ganymêtës, whom Zeus stole away to become his cup-bearer in Olympus, giving to his father Trôs, as the price of the youth, a team of immortal horses.³

From Ilus and Assaracus the Trojan and Dardanian lines diverge ; the former passing from Ilus to Laomedôn, Priam and

¹ Iliad, xx. 215.

² Hellanik. Fragn. 129, Didot ; Dionys. Hal. i. 50-61 ; Apollodôr. iii. 12, 1 ; Schol. Iliad. xviii. 486 ; Varro, ap. Servium ad Virgil. Aeneid. iii. 167 ; Kephalon. Gergithius ap. Steph. Byz. v. 'Απλοθη.

³ Iliad, v. 265 ; Hellanik. Fr. 146 ; Apollod. ii. v. 9.

Hectôr ; the latter from Assaracus to Capys, Anchisê and Æneas. Ilus founded in the plain of Troy the holy city of Ilium ; Assaracus and his descendants remained sovereigns of Dardania.¹

It was under the proud Laomedôn, son of Ilus, that Poseidôn and Apollo underwent, by command of Zeus, a temporary servitude ; the former building the walls of the town, the latter tending the flocks and herds. When their task was completed and the penal period had expired, they claimed the stipulated reward ; but Laomedôn angrily repudiated their demand, and even threatened to cut off their ears, to tie them hand and foot, and to sell them in some distant island as slaves.² He was punished for this treachery by a sea-monster, whom Poseidôn sent to ravage his fields and to destroy his subjects. Laomedôn publicly offered the immortal horses given by Zeus to his father Trôs, as a reward to any one who would destroy the monster. But an oracle declared that a virgin of noble blood must be surrendered to him, and the lot fell upon Hesionê, daughter of Laomedôn himself. Héraklês, arriving at this critical moment, killed the monster by the aid of a fort built for him by Athénê and the Trojans,³ so as to rescue both the exposed maiden and the people ; but Laomedôn, by a second act of perfidy, gave him mortal horses in place of the matchless animals which had been promised. Thus defrauded of his due, Héraklês equipped six ships, attacked and captured Troy and killed Laomedôn,⁴ giving Hesionê to his friend and auxiliary Telamôn, to whom she bore the celebrated archer Teukros.⁵ A painful sense of this expedition was preserved among the inhabitants of the historical town of Ilium, who offered no worship to Héraklês.⁶

Among all the sons of Laomedôn, Priam⁷ was the only one

¹ Iliad, xx. 236.

² Iliad, vii. 451 ; xxi. 456. Hesiod. ap. Schol. Lycophr. 393.

³ Iliad, xx. 145 ; Dionys. Hal. i. 52.

⁴ Iliad, v. 640. Meneklês (ap. Schol. Venet. *ad loc.*) affirmed that this expedition of Héraklês was a fiction ; but Dikearchus gave, besides, other exploits of the hero in the same neighbourhood, at Thêbê Hypoplakiê (Schol. Iliad. vi. 396).

⁵ Diodôr. iv. 32-49. Compare Venet. Schol. ad Iliad. viii. 284.

⁶ Strabo, xiii. p. 596.

⁷ As Dardanus, Trôs and Ilus are respectively eponyms of Dardania, Troy and Ilium, so Priam is eponym of the acropolis *Pergamum*. Πρίαμος is in the Æolic dialect Πέρραμος (Hesychius) : upon which Ahrens remarks, “Cæterum ex hac Æolicâ nominis formâ appetet, Priamum non minus arcis Περγάμων eponymum esse, quam Ilium urbis, Troem populi : Πέργαμα enim a Περίαμα natum est, i in γ̄ mutato.” (Ahrens, *De Dialecto Æolicâ*, 8, 7, p. 56 ; compare ibid. 28, 8, p. 150, περβ' ἀπάλω).

who had remonstrated against the refusal of the well-earned guerdon of Héraklēs; for which the hero recompensed him by placing him on the throne. Many and distinguished were his sons and daughters, as well by his wife Hekabē, daughter of Kisseus, as by other women.¹ Among the sons were Hectōr,² Paris, Dēiphobus, Helenus, Trōilus, Politēs, Polydōrus; among the daughters Laodikē, Kreüsa, Polyxena, and Kassandra.

The birth of Paris was preceded by formidable presages; for Hekabē dreamt that she was delivered of a firebrand, and Priam, on consulting the soothsayers, was informed that the son about to be born would prove fatal to him. Accordingly he directed the child to be exposed on Mount Ida; but the inauspicious kindness of the gods preserved him; and he grew up amidst the flocks and herds, active and beautiful, fair of hair and symmetrical in person, and the special favourite of Aphroditē.³

It was to this youth, in his solitary shepherd's walk on Mount Ida, that the three goddesses Hérē, Athēnē and Aphroditē were conducted, in order that he might determine the dispute respecting their comparative beauty, which had arisen at the nuptials of Pēleus and Thetis,—a dispute brought about in pursuance of the arrangement, and in accomplishment of the deep-laid designs, of Zeus. For Zeus, remarking with pain the immoderate numbers of the then existing heroic race, pitied the earth for the overwhelming burden which she was compelled to bear, and determined to lighten it by exciting a destructive and long-continued war.⁴ Paris awarded the

¹ Iliad, vi. 245; xxiv. 495.

² Hectōr was affirmed, both by Stesichorus and Ibykus, to be the son of Apollo (Stesichorus, ap. Schol. Ven. ad Iliad. xxiv. 259; Ibyki Fragm. xiv. ed. Schneidewin): both Euphoriōn (Fr. 125, Meineke) and Alexander Aētōlus follow the same idea. Stesichorus further stated, that after the siege Apollo had carried Hekabē away into Lykia to rescue her from captivity (Pausanias, x. 27, 1): according to Euripidēs, Apollo had promised that she should die in Troy (Troad. 427).

By Sapphō, Hectōr was given as a surname of Zeus, Ζεὺς Ἔκτωρ (Hesychius, v. Ἔκτωρ); a prince belonging to the regal family of Chios, anterior to the Ionic settlement, as mentioned by the Chian poet Iōn (Pausan. vii. 3, 3), was so called.

³ Iliad, iii. 45-55; Schol. Iliad. iii. 325; Hygin. fab. 91; Apollodōr. iii. 12, 5.

⁴ This was the motive assigned to Zeus by the old epic poem, the Cyprian Verses (Fragm. I, Dūntz. p. 12; ap. Schol. ad Iliad. i. 4)—

Ἡ δὲ ἴστορια παρὰ Στασίνῳ τῷ τὰ Κύπρια πεποιηκότι εἰπόντι οὕτως.

· Ήν ὅτε μύρια φύλα κατὰ χθόνα πλαζόμενα . . .

· βαρυστέρουν πλάτος αἴησ.

Ζεὺς δὲ ιδὼν ἐλέγησε, καὶ ἐν πυκιναῖς πραπίδεσσι

palm of beauty to Aphroditē, who promised him in recompense the possession of Helena, wife of the Spartan Menelaus, —the daughter of Zeus and the fairest of living women. At the instance of Aphroditē, ships were built for him, and he embarked on the enterprise so fraught with eventual disaster to his native city, in spite of the menacing prophecies of his brother Helenus, and the always neglected warnings of Kassandra.¹

Paris, on arriving at Sparta, was hospitably entertained by Menelaus as well as by Kastōr and Pollux, and was enabled to present the rich gifts which he had brought to Helen.² Menelaus then departed to Krête, leaving Helen to entertain his Trojan guest—a favourable moment which was employed by Aphroditē to bring about the intrigue and the elopement. Paris carried away with him both Helen and a large sum of money belonging to Menelaus—made a prosperous voyage to Troy—and arrived there safely with his prize on the third day.³

Menelaus, informed by Iris in Krête of the perfidious return made by Paris for his hospitality, hastened home in grief and

Σύνθετο κονφίσαι ἀνθρώπων παμβώτορα γαῖαν,
‘Ριπίσας πολέμου μεγάλην ἔριν Ἰλιακοῖο,
Οφρὰ κενώσειεν θανάτῳ βάρος: οἱ δὲ ἐν Τροίῃ
Ἡρῷες κτείνονται, Διὸς δὲ ἔτελείστοι βούλῃ.

The same motive is touched upon by Eurip. Orest. 1635; Helen. 38; and seriously maintained, as it seems, by Chrysippus, ap. Plutarch. Stoic. Rep. p. 1049: but the poets do not commonly go back farther than the passion of Paris for Helen (Theognis, 1232; Simonid. Amorg. Fragm. 6, 118).

The judgement of Paris was one of the scenes represented on the ancient chest of Kypselus at Olympia (Pausan. v. 19, 1).

¹ Argument of the *Ἐπη Κύπρια* (ap. Dünzter, p. 10). These warnings of Kassandra form the subject of the obscure and affected poem of Lycophrōn.

² According to the Cyprian Verses, Helena was daughter of Zeus by Nemesis, who had in vain tried to evade the connexion (Athenæ. viii. 334). Hesiod (Schol. Pindar. Nem. x. 150) represented her as daughter of Oceanus and Tēthys, an oceanic nymph: Sapphō (Fragm. 17, Schneidewin), Pausanias (i. 33, 7), Apollodōrus (iii. 10, 7), and Isokratēs (Encom. Helen. v. ii. p. 366, Auger) reconcile the pretensions of Lēda and Nemesis to a sort of joint maternity (see Heinrichsen. *De Carminibus Cypriis*, p. 45-46).

³ Herodot. ii. 117. He gives distinctly the assertion of the Cyprian Verses which contradicts the argument of the poem as it appears in Proclus (Fragm. 1, 1), according to which latter Paris is driven out of his course by a storm and captures the city of Sidōn. Homer (Iliad, vi. 293) seems, however, to countenance the statement in the argument.

That Paris was guilty of robbery, as well as of the abduction of Helen, is several times mentioned in the Iliad (iii. 144; vii. 350-363), also in the argument of the Cyprian Verses (see Aeschyl. Agam. 534).

indignation to consult with his brother Agamemnôn, as well as with the venerable Nestôr, on the means of avenging the outrage. They made known the event to the Greek chiefs around them, among whom they found universal sympathy: Nestôr, Palamêdês and others went round to solicit aid in a contemplated attack of Troy, under the command of Agamemnôn, to whom each chief promised both obedience and unwearyed exertion until Helen should be recovered.¹ Ten years were spent in equipping the expedition. The goddesses Hérê and Athénê, incensed at the preference given by Paris to Aphrodítê, and animated by steady attachment to Argos, Sparta, and Mykênæ, took an active part in the cause; and the horses of Hérê were fatigued with her repeated visits to the different parts of Greece.²

By such efforts a force was at length assembled at Aulis³ in Bœôtia, consisting of 1186 ships and more than 100,000 men,—a force outnumbering by more than ten to one anything that the Trojans themselves could oppose, and superior to the defenders of Troy even with all her allies included.⁴ It comprised heroes with their followers from the extreme points of Greece—from the north-western portions of Thessaly under Mount Olympus, as well as the western islands of Dulichium and Ithaca, and the eastern islands of Krête and Rhodes.

¹ The ancient epic (Schol. ad Il. ii. 286–339) does not recognise the story of the numerous suitors of Helen, and the oath by which Tyndareus bound them all before he made the selection among them that each should swear not only to acquiesce, but even to aid in maintaining undisturbed possession to the husband whom she should choose. This story seems to have been first told by Stesichorus (see Fragn. 20, ed. Kleine; Apollod. iii. 10, 8). Yet it was evidently one of the prominent features of the current legend in the time of Thucydidês (i. 9, Euripid. Iph. Aul. 51–80; Soph. Ajax, 1100).

The exact spot in which Tyndareus exacted this oath from the suitors, near Sparta, was pointed out even in the time of Pausanias (iii. 20, 9).

² Iliad, iv. 27–55: xxiv. 765, Argument Carm. Cypri. The point is emphatically touched upon by Dio Chrysostom (Orat. xi. p. 335–336) in his assault upon the old legend. Two years' preparation—in Dictys Cret. i. 16.

³ The Spartan king Agesilaus, when about to start from Greece on his expedition into Asia Minor (396 B.C.), went to Aulis personally, in order that he too might sacrifice on the spot where Agamemnôn had sacrificed when he sailed for Troy (Xenoph. Hellen. iii. 4, 4).

Skylax (c. 60) notices the *ιερὸν* at Aulis, and nothing else: it seems to have been like the adjoining Delium, a temple with a small village grown up around it.

Aulis is recognised as the port from which the expedition started, in the Hesiodic Works and Days (v. 650).

⁴ Iliad, ii. 128. Uschold (Geschichte des Trojanischen Kriegs, p. 9, Stuttgart, 1836) makes the total 135,000 men.

Agamemnôn himself contributed 100 ships manned with the subjects of his kingdom Mykénæ, besides furnishing 60 ships to the Arcadians, who possessed none of their own. Menelaus brought with him 60 ships, Nestôr from Pylus 90, Idomeneus from Krête and Diomêtôs from Argos, 80 each. Forty ships were manned by the Eleians, under four different chiefs; the like number under Meges from Dulichium and the Echinades, and under Thoas from Kalydôn and the other Ætôlian towns. Odysseus from Ithaca, and Ajax from Salamis, brought 12 ships each. The Abantes from Eubœa, under Elephénôr, filled 40 vessels; the Bœôtians, under Peneleôs and Léitus, 50; the inhabitants of Orchomenos and Aspledôn, 30; the light-armed Lokrians, under Ajax son of Oileus,¹ 40; the Phôkians as many. The Athenians, under Menestheus, a chief distinguished for his skill in marshalling an army, mustered 50 ships; the Myrmidons from Phthia and Hellas, under Achilles, assembled in 50 ships; Protesilaus from Phylakê and Pyrasus, and Eurypylus from Ormenium, each came with 40 ships; Machaôn and Podaleirius, from Trikka, with 30; Eumêlus, from Pheræ and the lake Bœbêis, with 11; and Philoktêtês from Melibœa with 7; the Lapithæ, under Polypoêtês, son of Peirithous, filled 40 vessels; the Ænianes and Perrhæbians, under Guneus,² 22; and the Magnêtês, under Prothous, 40; these last two were from the northernmost parts of Thessaly, near the mountains Pélion and Olympus. From Rhodes, under Tlepolemus, son of Héraklês, appeared 9 ships; from Symê, under the comely but effeminate Nireus, 3; from Kôs, Krapathus and the neighbouring islands, 30, under the orders of Pheidippus and Antiphus, sons of Thessalus and grandsons of Héraklês.³

Among this band of heroes were included the distinguished

¹ The Hesiodic Catalogue notices Oileus, or Ileus, with a singular etymology of his name (Frägm. 136, ed. Marktscheffel).

² Τούνευς is the Heros Eponymus of the town of Gonnus in Thessaly; the duplication of the consonant and shortening of the vowel belong to the Æolic dialect (Ahrens, De Dialect. Æolic. 50, 4, p. 220).

³ See the Catalogue in the second book of the Iliad. There must probably have been a Catalogue of the Greeks also in the Cyprian Verses; for a Catalogue of the allies of Troy is specially noticed in the Argument of Proclus (p. 12, Dünzter).

Euripidês (Iphig. Aul. 165-300) devotes one of the songs of the Chorus to a partial Catalogue of the chief heroes.

According to Dictys Cretensis, all the principal heroes engaged in the expedition were kinsmen, all Pelopids (i. 14): they take an oath not to lay down their arms until Helen shall have been recovered, and they receive from Agamemnôn a large sum of gold.

warriors Ajax and Diomédés, and the sagacious Nestôr ; while Agamemnôn himself, scarcely inferior to either of them in prowess, brought with him a high reputation for prudence in command. But the most marked and conspicuous of all were Achilles and Odysseus ; the former a beautiful youth born of a divine mother, swift in the race, of fierce temper and irresistible might ; the latter not less efficient as an ally, from his eloquence, his untiring endurance, his inexhaustible resources under difficulty, and the mixture of daring courage with deep-laid cunning which never deserted him :¹ the blood of the arch-deceiver Sisyphus, through an illicit connexion with his mother Antikleia, was said to flow in his veins,² and he was especially patronised and protected by the goddess Athénê. Odysseus, unwilling at first to take part in the expedition, had even simulated insanity ; but Palamédés, sent to Ithaca to invite him, tested the reality of his madness by placing in the furrow where Odysseus was ploughing, his infant son Telemachus. Thus detected, Odysseus could not refuse to join the Achæan host, but the prophet Halithersês predicted to him that twenty years would elapse before he revisited his native land.³ To Achilles the gods had promised the full effulgence of heroic glory before the walls of Troy ; nor could the place be taken without both his co-operation and that of his son after him. But they had forewarned him that this brilliant career would be rapidly brought to a close ; and that if he desired a long life, he must remain tranquil and inglorious in his native land. In spite of the reluctance of his mother Thetis, he preferred few years with bright renown, and joined the Achæan host.⁴ When Nestôr and Odysseus came to Phthia to invite him, both he and his intimate friend Patroklos eagerly obeyed the call.⁵

Agamemnôn and his powerful host set sail from Aulis ; but

¹ For the character of Odysseus, Iliad, iii. 202-220 ; x. 247. Odyss. xiii. 295.

The Philoktêtês of Sophoklês carries out very justly the character of the Homeric Odysseus (see v. 1035)—more exactly than the Ajax of the same poet depicts it.

² Sophokl. Philoktêt. 417, and Schol.—also Schol. ad Soph. Ajac. 190.

³ Homer, Odyss. xxiv. 115 ; Æschyl. Agam. 841 ; Sophokl. Philoktêt. 1011, with the Schol. Argument of the Cypria in Heinrichsen, De Carmin. Cypr. p. 23 (the sentence is left out in Dünzter, p. 11).

A lost tragedy of Sophoklês, 'Οδυσσεὺς Μαινόμενος, handled this subject.

Other Greek chiefs were not less reluctant than Odysseus to take part in the expedition ; see the tale of Poemandrus, forming a part of the temple legend of the Achilleum at Tanagra in Boeotia (Plutarch. Quæst. Græc. p. 299).

⁴ Iliad, i. 352 ; ix. 411.

⁵ Iliad, xi. 782.

being ignorant of the locality and the direction, they landed by mistake in Teuthrania, a part of Mysia near the river Kaikus, and began to ravage the country under the persuasion that it was the neighbourhood of Troy. Telephus, the king of the country,¹ opposed and repelled them, but was ultimately defeated and severely wounded by Achilles. The Greeks, now discovering their mistake, retired; but their fleet was dispersed by a storm and driven back to Greece. Achilles attacked and took Skyrus, and there married Deidamia, the daughter of Lycomédēs.² Telephus, suffering from his wounds, was directed by the oracle to come to Greece and present himself to Achilles to be healed, by applying the scrapings of the spear with which the wound had been given: thus restored, he became the guide of the Greeks when they were prepared to renew their expedition.³

The armament was again assembled at Aulis, but the goddess Artemis, displeased with the boastful language of Agamemnôn, prolonged the duration of adverse winds, and the offending chief was compelled to appease her by the well-known sacrifice of his daughter Iphigeneia.⁴ They then pro-

¹ Telephus was the son of Augê, daughter of king Aleus of Tegea in Arcadia, by Héraklês: respecting her romantic adventures, see the previous chapter on Arcadian legends—Strabo's faith in the story (xii. p. 572).

The spot called the harbour of the Achaeans, near Gryneium, was stated to be the place where Agamemnôn and the chiefs took counsel whether they should attack Telephus or not (Skylax, c. 97; compare Strabo, xiv. p. 622).

² Iliad, xi. 664; Argum. Cypr. p. 11, Dünzter; Diktys Cret. ii. 3-4.

³ Euripid. Telephus, Fragn. 26, Dindorf; Hygin. f. 101; Diktys, ii. 10. Euripidēs had treated the adventure of Telephus in this lost tragedy: he gave the miraculous cure with the dust of the spear, *πριστοῖσι λόγχης θέλγεται ρυῆμασι*. Diktys softens down the prodigy: “Achilles cum Machaone et Podalirio adhibentes curam vulneri,” &c. Pliny (xxxiv. 15) gives to the rust of brass or iron a place in the list of genuine remedies.

“Longe omnino a Tiberi ad Caicum: quo in loco etiam Agamemnôn errasset, nisi ducem Telephum invenisset” (Cicero, Pro L. Flacco, c. 29). The portions of the Trojan legend treated in the lost epics and the tragedians, seem to have been just as familiar to Cicero as those noticed in the Iliad.

Strabo pays comparatively little attention to any portion of the Trojan war except what appears in Homer. He even goes so far as to give a reason why the Amazons *did not* come to the aid of Priam: they were at enmity with him, because Priam had aided the Phrygians against them (Iliad, iii. 188: in Strabo, *τοῖς Ἰῶσι* must be a mistake for *τοῖς Φρυξίνοις*). Strabo can hardly have read, and never alludes to, Arktinus, in whose poem the brave and beautiful Penthesileia, at the head of her Amazons, forms a marked epoch and incident of the war (Strabo, xii. 552).

⁴ Nothing occurs in Homer respecting the sacrifice of Iphigeneia (see Schol. Ven. ad Il. ix. 145).

ceeded to Tenedos, from whence Odysseus and Menelaus were despatched as envoys to Troy, to redemand Helen and the stolen property. In spite of the prudent counsels of Antenor, who received the two Grecian chiefs with friendly hospitality, the Trojans rejected the demand, and the attack was resolved upon. It was foredoomed by the gods that the Greek who first landed should perish : Protesilaus was generous enough to put himself upon this forlorn hope, and accordingly fell by the hand of Hector.

Meanwhile the Trojans had assembled a large body of allies from various parts of Asia Minor and Thrace : Dardanians under Aeneas, Lykians under Sarpedon, Mysians, Karians, Maeonians, Alizonians,¹ Phrygians, Thracians and Paeonians.² But vain was the attempt to oppose the landing of the Greeks : the Trojans were routed, and even the invulnerable Kyknus,³ son of Poseidon, one of the great bulwarks of the defence, was slain by Achilles. Having driven the Trojans within their walls Achilles attacked and stormed Lyrnessus, Pedasus, Lesbos and other places in the neighbourhood, twelve towns on the sea-coast, and eleven in the interior : he drove off the oxen of Aeneas and pursued the hero himself, who narrowly escaped with his life : he surprised and killed the youthful Troilus, son of Priam, and captured several of the other sons, whom he sold as prisoners into the islands of the Aegean.⁴ He acquired

¹ No portion of the Homeric Catalogue gave more trouble to Demetrius of Skëpsis and the other expositors than these Alizonians (Strabo, xii. p. 549; xiii. p. 603) : a fictitious place called Alizonium, in the region of Ida, was got up to meet the difficulty (*εἰτ' Ἀλιζώνιον, τούτ' ἡδη πεπλασμένον πρὸς τὴν τῶν Ἀλιζώνων ὑπόθεσιν*, &c., Strabo, l. c.).

² See the Catalogue of the Trojans (Iliad, ii. 815-877).

³ Kyknus was said by later writers to be king of Kolonæ in the Troad (Strabo, xiii. p. 589-603; Aristotel. Rhetoric. ii. 23). Aeschylus introduced upon the Attic stage both Kyknus and Memnon in terrific equipments (Aristophan. Ran. 957. Οὐδὲ ἐξέπληττον ἀντούσις Κύκνους ἄγων καὶ Μέμυνον καδωνοφαλαροπάλους). Compare Welcker, Aeschyl. Trilogie, p. 433.

⁴ Iliad, xxiv. 752; Argument of the Cypria, pp. 11, 12, Dünzter. These desultory exploits of Achilles furnished much interesting romance to the later Greek poets (see Parthenius, Narrat. 21). See the neat summary of the principal events of the war in Quintus Smyrn. xiv. 125-140; Dio Chrysost. Or. xi. p. 338-342.

Troilus is only once named in the Iliad (xxiv. 253) ; he was mentioned also in the Cypria ; but his youth, beauty, and untimely end made him an object of great interest with the subsequent poets. Sophokles had a tragedy called *Troilus* (Welcker, Griechisch. Tragöd. i. p. 124) ; Τὸν ἀνδρόταιδα δεσπότην ἀπάλεσα, one of the Fragm. Even earlier than Sophokles, his beauty was celebrated by the tragedian Phrynicus (Athenæ. xiii. p. 564; Virgil, Aeneid, i. 474; Lycophron, 307).

as his captive the fair Brisēis, while Chrysēis was awarded to Agamemnōn: he was moreover eager to see the divine Helen, the prize and stimulus of this memorable struggle; and Aphrodīte and Thetis contrived to bring about an interview between them.¹

At this period of the war the Grecian army was deprived of Palamēdēs, one of its ablest chiefs. Odysseus had not forgiven the artifice by which Palamēdēs had detected his simulated insanity, nor was he without jealousy of a rival clever and cunning in a degree equal, if not superior, to himself; one who had enriched the Greeks with the invention of letters, of dice for amusement, of night-watches, as well as with other useful suggestions. According to the old Cyprian epic, Palamēdēs was drowned while fishing, by the hands of Odysseus and Diomēdēs.² Neither in the Iliad nor the Odyssey does the name of Palamēdēs occur; the lofty position which Odysseus occupies in both those poems—noticed with some degree of displeasure even by Pindar, who described Palamēdēs as the wiser man of the two—is sufficient to explain the omission.³ But in the more advanced period of the Greek mind, when intellectual superiority came to acquire a higher place in the public esteem as compared with military prowess, the character of Palamēdēs, combined with his unhappy fate, rendered him one of the most interesting personages in the Trojan legend. Æschylus, Sophoklēs and Euripidēs each consecrated to him a special tragedy; but the mode of his death as described in the old epic was not suitable to Athenian ideas, and accordingly he was represented as having been falsely accused of treason by Odysseus, who caused gold to be buried in his tent, and persuaded Agamemnōn and the Grecian chiefs that Palamēdēs had received it from the Trojans.⁴ He thus forfeited his life, a

¹ Argument. Cypr. p. 11, Dūntzer. *Καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα Ἀχιλλεὺς Ἐλένην ἐπιθυμεῖ θεσασθαι, καὶ συνήγαγον αὐτὸν εἰς τὸ αὐτὸν Ἀφροδίτην καὶ Θέτις.* A scene which would have been highly interesting in the hands of Homer.

² Argum. Cypr. i. 1; Pausan. x. 31. The concluding portion of the Cypria seems to have passed under the title of *Παλαμηδεῖα* (see Frag. 16 and 18, p. 15, Dūntzer; Welcker, *Der Episch. Cycl.* p. 459; Eustath. ad Hom. *Odyss.* i. 107).

The allusion of Quintus Smyrnaeus (v. 197) seems rather to point to the story in the Cypria, which Strabo (viii. p. 368) appears not to have read.

³ Pindar, *Nem.* vii. 21; Aristidēs, *Orat.* 46, p. 260.

⁴ See the Fragments of the three tragedians, *Παλαμηδῆς*—Aristeidēs, *Or. xlvi.* p. 260; Philostrat. *Heroic.* x.; Hygin. *fab.* 95-105. Discourses for and against Palamēdēs, one by Alkidamas, and one under the name of Gorgias, are printed in Reiske's *Orr. Græc.* t. viii. pp. 64, 102; Virgil, *Aeneid.* ii. 82, with the ample commentary of Servius—Polyæn. *Proœ.* p. 6.

victim to the calumny of Odysseus and to the delusion of the leading Greeks. The philosopher Sokratés, in the last speech made to his Athenian judges, alludes with solemnity and fellow-feeling to the unjust condemnation of Palamédés, as analogous to that which he himself was about to suffer; and his companions seem to have dwelt with satisfaction on the comparison. Palamédés passed for an instance of the slanderous enmity and misfortune which so often wait upon superior genius.¹

In these expeditions the Grecian army consumed nine years, during which the subdued Trojans dared not give battle without their walls for fear of Achilles. Ten years was the fixed epic duration of the siege of Troy, just as five years was the duration of the siege of Kamikus by the Krétan armament which came to avenge the death of Minôs:² ten years of preparation, ten years of siege, and ten years of wandering for Odysseus, were periods suited to the rough chronological dashes of the ancient epic, and suggesting no doubts nor difficulties with the original hearers. But it was otherwise when the same events came to be contemplated by the historicising Greeks, who could not be satisfied without either finding or inventing satisfactory bonds of coherence between the separate events. Thucydidés tells us that the Greeks were less numerous than the poets have represented, and that being moreover very poor, they were unable to procure adequate and constant provisions: hence they were compelled to disperse their army, and to employ a part of it in cultivating the Chersonese,—a part in marauding expeditions over the neighbourhood. Could the whole army have been employed against Troy at once (he says), the siege would have been much more speedily and easily

Welcker (Griechisch. Tragöd. v. i. p. 130, vol. ii. p. 500) has evolved with ingenuity the remaining fragments of the lost tragedies.

According to Dikty, Odysseus and Diomédés prevail upon Palamédés to be let down into a deep well, and then cast stones upon him (ii. 15).

Xenophon (De Venatione, c. 1) evidently recognises the story in the Cypria, that Odysseus and Diomédés caused the death of Palamédés: but he *cannot* believe that two such exemplary men were really guilty of so iniquitous an act—*κακοὶ δὲ ἔπραξαν τὸ ἔργον*.

The marked eminence overtopping Napoli still bears the name of *Palamidhi*.

¹ Plato, *Apolog.* Socr. c. 32; Xenoph. *Apol.* Socr. 26; *Memor.* iv. 2, 33; Liban. *pro Socr.* p. 242, ed. Morell.; Lucian, *Dial.* Mort. 20.

² Herodot. vii. 170. Ten years is a proper mythical period for a great war to last: the war between the Olympic gods and the Titan gods lasts ten years (*Hesiod, Theogon.* 636). Compare *δεκάτη ἐνιαυτῷ* (*Hom. Odys.* xvi. 17).

concluded.¹ If the great historian could permit himself thus to amend the legend in so many points, we might have imagined that a simpler course would have been to include the duration of the siege among the list of poetical exaggerations, and to affirm that the real siege had lasted only one year instead of ten. But it seems that the ten years' duration was so capital a feature in the ancient tale, that no critic ventured to meddle with it.

A period of comparative intermission however was now at hand for the Trojans. The gods brought about the memorable fit of anger of Achilles, under the influence of which he refused to put on his armour, and kept his Myrmidons in camp. According to the Cypria, this was the behest of Zeus, who had compassion on the Trojans : according to the Iliad, Apollo was the originating cause,² from anxiety to avenge the injury which his priest Chrysēs had endured from Agamemnōn. For a considerable time, the combats of the Greeks against Troy were conducted without their best warrior, and severe indeed was the humiliation which they underwent in consequence. How the remaining Grecian chiefs vainly strove to make amends for his absence—how Hectōr and the Trojans defeated and drove them to their ships—how the actual blaze of the destroying flame, applied by Hectōr to the ship of Protesilaus, roused up the anxious and sympathising Patroklos, and extorted a reluctant consent from Achilles, to allow his friend and his followers to go forth and avert the last extremity of ruin—how Achilles, when Patroklos had been killed by Hectōr, forgetting his anger in grief for the death of his friend, re-entered the fight, drove the Trojans within their walls with immense slaughter, and satiated his revenge both upon the living and the dead Hectōr—all these events have been chronicled, together with those divine dispensations on which most of them are made to depend, in the immortal verse of the Iliad.

Homer breaks off with the burial of Hectōr, whose body has just been ransomed by the disconsolate Priam ; while the lost poem of Arktinus, entitled the *Æthiopis*, so far as we can judge from the argument still remaining of it, handled only the subsequent events of the siege. The poem of Quintus Smyrnaeus, composed about the fourth century of the Christian æra, seems in its first books to coincide with the *Æthiopis*, in the subsequent books partly with the *Ilias Minor* of Leschēs.³

¹ Thucyd. i. 1.

² Homer, Iliad, i. 21.

³ Tychsen, *Commentat. de Quinto Smyrnæo*, § iii. c. 5-7. The *'Ιλαῖον Νέπος* was treated both by Arktinus and by Leschēs : with the latter it formed a part of the *Ilias Minor*.

The Trojans, dismayed by the death of Hectōr, were again animated with hope by the appearance of the warlike and beautiful queen of the Amazons, Penthesileia, daughter of Arēs, hitherto invincible in the field, who came to their assistance from Thrace at the head of a band of her countrywomen. She again led the besieged without the walls to encounter the Greeks in the open field; and under her auspices the latter were at first driven back, until she too was slain by the invincible arm of Achilles. The victor, on taking off the helmet of his fair enemy as she lay on the ground, was profoundly affected and captivated by her charms, for which he was scornfully taunted by Thersitēs: exasperated by this rash insult, he killed Thersitēs on the spot with a blow of his fist. A violent dispute among the Grecian chiefs was the result, for Diomēdēs, the kinsman of Thersitēs, warmly resented the proceeding; and Achilles was obliged to go to Lesbos, where he was purified from the act of homicide by Odysseus.¹

Next arrived Memnōn, son of Tithōnus and Eōs, the most stately of living men, with a powerful band of black Ethiopians, to the assistance of Troy. Sallying forth against the Greeks, he made great havoc among them: the brave and popular Antilochus perished by his hand, a victim to filial devotion in defence of Nestōr.² Achilles at length attacked him, and for a long time the combat was doubtful between them: the prowess of Achilles and the supplication of Thetis with Zeus finally prevailed; whilst Eōs obtained for her vanquished son the consoling gift of immortality. His tomb, however,³ was shown

¹ Argument of the *Æthiopis*, p. 16, Dūntzer; Quint. Smyrn. lib. i.; Dikty Cret. iv. 2-3.

In the *Philoktētēs* of Sophoklēs, Thersitēs survives Achilles (Soph. Phil. 358-445).

² Odyss. xi. 522. *Κεῖνον δὴ κάλλιστον Ίδον, μετὰ Μέμνονα δῖον*: see also Odyss. iv. 187; Pindar, Pyth. vi. 31. *Æschylus* (ap. Strabo. xv. p. 728) conceives Memnōn as a Persian starting from Susa.

Ktesias gave in his history full details respecting the expedition of Memnōn, sent by the king of Assyria to the relief of his dependent, Priam of Troy; all this was said to be recorded in the royal archives. The Egyptians affirmed that Memnōn had come from Egypt (Diodōr. ii. 22; compare iv. 77): the two stories are blended together in Pausanias, x. 31, 2. The Phrygians pointed out the road along which he had marched.

³ Argum. *Æth. ut sup.*: Quint. Smyrn. ii. 396-550; Pausan. x. 31, 1. Pindar, in praising Achilles, dwells much on his triumphs over Hectōr, Telephus, Memnōn, and Kyknus, but never notices Penthesileia (Olymp. ii. 90. Nem. iii. 60; vi. 52. Isthm. v. 43).

Æschylus, in the *Ψυχοστρατία*, introduced Thetis and Eōs, each in an attitude of supplication for her son, and Zeus weighing in his golden scales the souls of Achilles and Memnōn (Schol. Ven. ad Iliad. viii. 70; Pollux,

near the Propontis, within a few miles of the mouth of the river *Æsēpus*, and was visited annually by the birds called *Memnonidēs*, who swept it and bedewed it with water from the stream. So the traveller Pausanias was told, even in the second century after the Christian æra, by the Hellespontine Greeks.

But the fate of Achilles himself was now at hand. After routing the Trojans, and chasing them into the town, he was slain near the Skæan gate by an arrow from the quiver of Paris, directed under the unerring auspices of Apollo.¹ The greatest efforts were made by the Trojans to possess themselves of the body, which was however rescued and borne off to the Grecian camp by the valour of Ajax and Odysseus. Bitter was the grief of Thetis for the loss of her son : she came into the camp with the Muses and the Nêreids to mourn over him ; and when a magnificent funeral-pile had been prepared by the Greeks to burn him with every mark of honour, she stole away the body and conveyed it to a renewed and immortal life in the island of Leukê in the Euxine Sea. According to some accounts he was there blest with the nuptials and company of Helen.²

Thetis celebrated splendid funeral games in honour of her son, and offered the unrivalled panoply, which Hêphæstos had forged and wrought for him, as a prize to the most distinguished warrior in the Grecian army. Odysseus and Ajax became rivals for the distinction, when Athénê, together with some Trojan prisoners, who were asked from which of the two their country had sustained greatest injury, decided in favour of the former. The gallant Ajax lost his senses with grief and humiliation : in a fit

iv. 130 ; Plutarch, *De Audiend. Poet.* p. 17). In the combat between Achilles and Memnōn, represented on the chest of Kypselus at Olympia, Thetis and Eôs were given each as aiding her son (Pausan. v. 19, 1).

¹ Iliad, xxii. 360 ; Sophokl. *Philokt.* 334 ; Virgil, *Æneid*, vi. 56.

² Argum. *Æthiop. ut sup.* ; Quint. Smyrn. 151-583 ; Homer, *Odyss.* v. 310 ; Ovid, *Metam.* xiii. 284 ; Eurip. *Androm.* 1262 ; Pausan. iii. 19, 13. According to Diktyς (iv. 11), Paris and Deiphobus entrap Achilles by the promise of an interview with Polyxena and kill him.

A minute and curious description of the Island Leukê, or *Αχιλλέως νῆσος*, is given in Arrian (*Periplus, Pont. Euxin.* p. 21 ; ap. *Geogr. Min.* t. 1).

The heroic or divine empire of Achilles in Scythia was recognised by Alkæus the poet (Alkæi *Fragm.* Schneidew. Fr. 46), *Αχιλλεῦ, δῆνας Σκυθικᾶς μέδεις*. Eustathius (ad Dionys. *Periégêt.* 307) gives the story of his having followed Iphigeneia thither : compare Antonin. *Liberal.* 27.

Ibycus represented Achilles as having espoused Mêdeia in the Elysian Field (Ibyk. *Fragm.* 18, Schneidewin). Simonidês followed this story (ap. *Schol. Apoll. Rhod.* iv. 815).

of frenzy he slew some sheep, mistaking them for the men who had wronged him, and then fell upon his own sword.¹

Odysseus now learnt from Helenus son of Priam, whom he had captured in an ambuscade,² that Troy could not be taken unless both Philoktêtês and Neoptolemus, son of Achilles, could be prevailed upon to join the besiegers. The former, having been stung in the foot by a serpent, and becoming insupportable to the Greeks from the stench of his wound, had been left at Lemnus in the commencement of the expedition, and had spent ten years³ in misery on that desolate island : but he still possessed the peerless bow and arrows of Héraklês, which were said to be essential to the capture of Troy. Diomedês fetched Philoktêtês from Lemnus to the Grecian camp, where he was healed by the skill of Machaôn,⁴ and took an active part against the Trojans—engaging in single combat with Paris, and killing him with one of the Hérakleian arrows. The Trojans were allowed to carry away for burial the body of this prince, the fatal cause of all their sufferings ; but not until it had been mangled by the hand of Menelaus.⁵ Odysseus went

¹ Argument of *Æthiopis* and *Ilias Minor*, and *Fragm. 2* of the latter, pp. 17, 18, Düntz. : Quint. Smyrn. v. 120-482 ; Hom. *Odyss.* xi. 550 ; Pindar, Nem. vii. 26. The Ajax of Sophoklês, and the contending speeches between Ajax and Ulysses in the beginning of the thirteenth book of Ovid's *Metamorphoses* are too well known to need special reference.

The suicide of Ajax seems to have been described in detail in the *Æthiopis* : compare Pindar, *Isthm.* iii. 51, and the *Scholia ad loc.*, which show the attention paid by Pindar to the minute circumstances of the old epic. See *Fragm. 2* of the *Ιάλου Πέρσις* of Arktinus, in Düntz, p. 22, which would seem more properly to belong to the *Æthiopis*. Dikty斯 relates the suicide of Ajax, as a consequence of his unsuccessful competition with Odysseus, not about the arms of Achilles, but about the Palladium, after the taking of the city (v. 14).

There were, however, many different accounts of the manner in which Ajax had died, some of which are enumerated in the argument to the drama of Sophoklês. Ajax is never wounded in the *Iliad* : Æschylus made him invulnerable except under the armpits (see *Schol. ad Sophokl. Ajac.* 833) ; the Trojans pelted him with mud—*εἰ πώς βαρηθείη ὑπὸ τοῦ πηλοῦ*. (*Schol. Iliad.* xiv. 404.)

² Soph. *Philokt.* 604.

³ Soph. *Philokt.* 703. ⁴ Ω μελέα ψυχά, “Ος μηδ’ οίνοχύτου πόματος” *Ησθη δεκετῆ χρόνον*, &c.

In the narrative of Dikty斯 (ii. 47), Philoktêtês returns from Lemnus to Troy much earlier in the war, before the death of Achilles, and without any assigned cause.

⁴ According to Sophoklês, Héraklês sends Asklepius to Troy to heal Philoktêtês (Soph. *Philokt.* 1415).

The story of Philoktêtês formed the subject of a tragedy by Æschylus and of another by Euripidês (both lost) as well as by Sophoklês.

⁵ Argument. *Iliad. Minor.* Düntz. I. c. *Kαὶ τὸν νεκρὸν ὑπὸ Μενελάου*

to the island of Skyrus to invite Neoptolemus to the army. The untried but impetuous youth, gladly obeying the call, received from Odysseus his father's armour; while on the other hand, Eurypylus, son of Tēlephus, came from Mysia as auxiliary to the Trojans and rendered to them valuable service—turning the tide of fortune for a time against the Greeks, and killing some of their bravest chiefs, amongst whom were numbered Peneleōs, and the unrivalled leech Machaōn.¹ The exploits of Neoptolemus were numerous, worthy of the glory of his race and the renown of his father. He encountered and slew Eurypylus, together with numbers of the Mysian warriors: he routed the Trojans and drove them within their walls, from whence they never again emerged to give battle: and he was not less distinguished for good sense and persuasive diction than for forward energy in the field.²

Troy however was still impregnable so long as the Palladium, a statue given by Zeus himself to Dardanus, remained in the citadel; and great care had been taken by the Trojans not only to conceal this valuable present, but to construct other statues so like it as to mislead any intruding robber. Nevertheless the enterprising Odysseus, having disguised his person with miserable clothing and self-inflicted injuries, found means to penetrate into the city and to convey the Palladium by stealth away. Helen alone recognised him; but she was now anxious to

καταικισθέντα ἀνελόμενοι θάπτουσιν οἱ Τρῶες. See Quint. Smyrn. x. 240: he differs here in many respects from the arguments of the old poems as given by Proclus, both as to the incidents and as to their order in time (Diktys, iv. 20). The wounded Paris flees to Cēnōnē, whom he had deserted in order to follow Helen, and entreats her to cure him by her skill in simples: she refuses, and permits him to die; she is afterwards stung with remorse, and hangs herself (Quint. Smyrn. x. 285-331; Apollodōr. iii. 12, 6; Conōn, Narrat. 23; see Bachet de Meziriac, Comment. sur les Epîtres d'Ovide, t. i. p. 456). The story of Cēnōnē is as old as Hellanikus and Kephalōn of Gergis (see Hellan. Fragm. 126, Didot).

¹ To mark the way in which these legendary events pervaded and became embodied in the local worship, I may mention the received practice in the great temple of Asklepius (father of Machaōn) at Pergamus, even in the time of Pausanias. Tēlephus, father of Eurypylus, was the local hero and mythical king of Teuthrania, in which Pergamus was situated. In the hymns there sung, the poem and the invocation were addressed to Tēlephus; but nothing was said in them about Eurypylus, nor was it permitted even to mention his name in the temple,—“they knew him to be the slayer of Machaōn:” *ἄρχονται μὲν ἀπὸ Τηλέφου τῶν ὕμνων, προσάρδουσι δὲ οὐδὲν ἐς τὸν Εὐρύπυλον, οὐδὲ ἀρχὴν ἐν τῷ ναῷ θέλουσιν ὀνομάζειν αὐτὸν, οἷα ἐπιστάμενοι φογέα ὄντα Μαχάονος* (Pausan. iii. 26, 7).

² Argument. Iliad. Minor. p. 17, Dūntzer. Homer, Odyss. xi. 510-520. Pausan. iii. 26, 7. Quint. Smyrn. vii. 553; viii. 201.

return to Greece, and even assisted Odysseus inconcerting means for the capture of the town.¹

To accomplish this object, one final stratagem was resorted to. By the hands of Epeius of Panopeus, and at the suggestion of Athénè, a capacious hollow wooden horse was constructed, capable of containing one hundred men. In the inside of this horse, the *élite* of the Grecian heroes, Neoptolemus, Odysseus, Menelaus and others, concealed themselves while the entire Grecian army sailed away to Tenedos, burning their tents and pretending to have abandoned the siege. The Trojans, overjoyed to find themselves free, issued from the city and contemplated with astonishment the fabric which their enemies had left behind. They long doubted what should be done with it; and the anxious heroes from within heard the surrounding consultations, as well as the voice of Helen when she pronounced their names and counterfeited the accents of their wives.² Many of the Trojans were anxious to dedicate it to the gods in the city as a token of gratitude for their deliverance; but the more cautious spirits inculcated distrust of an enemy's legacy. Laocoön, the priest of Poseidôn, manifested his aversion by striking the side of the horse with his spear. The sound revealed that the horse was hollow, but the Trojans heeded not this warning of possible fraud. The unfortunate Laocoön, a victim to his own sagacity and patriotism, miserably perished before the eyes of his countrymen, together with one of his sons: two serpents being sent expressly by the gods out of the sea to destroy him. By this terrific spectacle, together with the perfidious counsels of Sinon—a traitor whom the Greeks had left behind for the special purpose of giving false information—the Trojans were induced to make a breach in their own walls, and to drag the fatal fabric with triumph and exultation into their city.³

¹ Argument. Iliad. Minor. p. 18, Düntz.; *Arktinus* ap. Dionys. Hal. i. 69; Homer, Odyss. iv. 246; Quint. Smyrn. x. 354; Virgil, *Æneid*, ii. 164, and the 9th Excursus of Heyne on that book.

Compare, with this legend about the Palladium, the Roman legend respecting the Ancylia (Ovid, Fasti, iii. 381).

² Odyss. iv. 275; Virgil, *Æneid*, ii. 14; Heyne, Excurs. 3. ad *Æneid*. ii. Stesichorus, in his *Ιλίου Πέρσις*, gave the number of heroes in the wooden horse as one hundred (Stesichor. Frigm. 26, ed. Kleine; compare Athenæ. xiii. p. 610).

³ Odyss. viii. 492; xi. 522. Argument of the *Ιλίου Πέρσις* of Arktinus, p. 21, Düntz. Hygin. f. 108-135. Bacchylidēs and Euphorion ap. Servium ad Virgil, *Æneid*. ii. 201.

Both Sinon and Laocoön came originally from the old epic poem of Arktinus, though Virgil may perhaps have immediately borrowed both

The destruction of Troy, according to the decree of the gods, was now irrevocably sealed. While the Trojans indulged in a night of riotous festivity, Sinon kindled the fire-signal to the Greeks at Tenedos, loosening the bolts of the wooden horse, from out of which the enclosed heroes descended. The city, assailed both from within and from without, was thoroughly sacked and destroyed; with the slaughter or captivity of the larger portion of its heroes as well as its people. The venerable Priam perished by the hand of Neoptolemus, having in vain sought shelter at the domestic altar of Zeus Herkeios. But his son Deiphobus, who since the death of Paris had become the husband of Helen, defended his house desperately against Odysseus and Menelaus, and sold his life dearly. After he was slain, his body was fearfully mutilated by the latter.¹

Thus was Troy utterly destroyed—the city, the altars and temples,² and the population. Æneas and Antenor were permitted to escape, with their families, having been always more favourably regarded by the Greeks than the remaining Trojans. According to one version of the story, they had betrayed the them, and other matters in his second book, from a poem passing under the name of Pisander (see Macrob. Satur. v. 2; Heyne, *Excurs.* I. ad *Æn.* ii.; Welcker, *Der Episch. Kyklus*, p. 97). We cannot give credit either to Arktinus or Pisander for the masterly specimen of oratory which is put into the mouth of Sinon in the *Æneid*.

In Quintus Smyrnaeus (xii. 366), the Trojans torture and mutilate Sinon to extort from him the truth: his endurance, sustained by the inspiration of Hérê, is proof against the extremity of suffering, and he adheres to his false tale. This is probably an incident of the old epic, though the delicate taste of Virgil, and his sympathy with the Trojans, has induced him to omit it. Euphorion ascribed the proceedings of Sinon to Odysseus: he also gave a different cause for the death of Laocoön (Fr. 35–36. p. 55, ed. Dünz., in the Fragments of Epic Poets after Alexander the Great). Sinon is ἑταῖρος Ὀδυσσέως in Pausan. x. 27, 1.

¹ Odys. viii. 515; Argument of Arktinus, *ut sup.*: Euripid. Hecub. 903; Virg. *Æn.* vi. 497; Quint. Smyrn. xiii. 35–229; Leschés ap. Pausan. x. 27, 2; Diktys, v. 12. Ibykus and Simonides also represented Deiphobus as the ἀντεράστης Ἐλένης (Schol. Hom. Iliad. xiii. 517).

The night battle in the interior of Troy was described with all its fearful details both by Leschés and Arktinus: the 'Ιλίον Πέρσις of the latter seems to have been a separate poem, that of the former constituted a portion of the Ilias Minor (see Welcker, *Der Epische Kyklus*, p. 215): the 'Ιλίον Πέρσις by the lyric poets Sakadas and Stesichorus probably added many new incidents. Polygnótus had painted a succession of the various calamitous scenes, drawn from the poem of Leschés, on the walls of the leschê at Delphi, with the name written over each figure (Pausan. x. 25–26).

Hellanikus fixed the precise day of the month on which the capture took place (Hellan. Fr. 143–144), the twelfth day of Thargeliôn.

² Æschl. Agamemn. 527—

Βωμοὶ δὲ ἀῖστοι καὶ θεῶν ιδρύμαται·
Καὶ σπέρμα πάσης ἔξαπόλλυται χθονός·

city to the Greeks: a panther's skin had been hung over the door of Antenor's house as a signal for the victorious besiegers to spare it in the general plunder.¹ In the distribution of the principal captives, Astyanax, the infant son of Hector, was cast from the top of the wall and killed, by Odysseus or Neoptolemus: Polyxena, the daughter of Priam, was immolated on the tomb of Achilles, in compliance with a requisition made by the shade of the deceased hero to his countrymen;² while her sister Cassandra was presented as a prize to Agamemnon. She had sought sanctuary at the altar of Athene, where Ajax, the son of Oileus, making a guilty attempt to seize her, had drawn both upon himself and upon the army the serious wrath of the goddess, insomuch that the Greeks could hardly be restrained from stoning him to death.³ Andromache and Helenus were both given to Neoptolemus, who, according to the *Ilias Minor*, carried away also Aeneas as his captive.⁴

Helen gladly resumed her union with Menelaus: she accompanied him back to Sparta, and lived with him there many years in comfort and dignity,⁵ passing afterwards to a happy immortality in the Elysian fields. She was worshipped as a goddess with her brothers the Dioskuri and her husband, having her temple, statue and altar at Therapnae and elsewhere. Various examples of her miraculous intervention were cited among the

¹ This symbol of treachery also figured in the picture of Polygnathus. A different story appears in Schol. *Iliad*. iii. 206.

² Euripid. *Hecub*. 38-114, and *Troad*. 716; Leschēs ap. Pausan. x. 25, 9; Virgil, *Aeneid*, iii. 322, and Servius *ad loc.*

A romantic tale is found in Dikty's respecting the passion of Achilles for Polyxena (iii. 2).

³ Odyss. xi. 422. Arktinus, Argum. p. 21, Dūntz. Theognis, 1232. Pausan. i. 15, 2; x. 26, 3; 31, 1. As an expiation for this sin of their national hero, the Lokrians sent to Ilium periodically some of their maidens, to do menial service in the temple of Athene (Plutarch, Ser. Numin. Vindict. p. 557, with the citation from Euphorion or Kallimachus, Dūntzer, Epicc. Vet. p. 118).

⁴ Leschēs, Fr. 7, Dūntz.; ap. Schol. *Lycophr*. 1263. Compare Schol. ad 1232, for the respectful recollection of Andromache, among the traditions of the Molossian kings, as their heroic mother, and Strabo, xiii. p. 594.

⁵ Such is the story of the old epic (see Odyss. iv. 260, and the fourth book generally; Argument of *Ilias Minor*, p. 20, Dūntz.). Polygnathus, in the paintings above alluded to, followed the same tale (Pausan. x. 25, 3).

The anger of the Greeks against Helen, and the statement that Menelaus after the capture of Troy approached her with revengeful purposes, but was so mollified by her surpassing beauty as to cast away his uplifted sword, belongs to the age of the tragedians (Æschyl. *Agamem*. 685-1455; Eurip. *Androm*. 600-629; *Helen*. 75-120; *Troad*. 890-1057; compare also the fine lines in the *Aeneid*, ii. 567-588).

Greeks.¹ The lyric poet Stesichorus had ventured to denounce her, conjointly with her sister Klytæmnêstra, in a tone of rude and plain-spoken severity, resembling that of Euripidês and Lykóphrôn afterwards, but strikingly opposite to the delicacy and respect with which she is always handled by Homer, who never admits reproaches against her except from her own lips.² He was smitten with blindness, and made sensible of his impiety; but having repented and composed a special poem

¹ See the description in Herodot. vi. 61, of the prayers offered to her, and of the miracle which she wrought, to remove the repulsive ugliness of a little Spartan girl of high family. Compare also Pindar, Olymp. iii. 2, and the Scholia at the beginning of the ode; Eurip. Helen. 1662, and Orest. 1652-1706; Isokrat. Encom. Helen. ii. p. 368, Auger; Dio Chrysost. Or. xi. p. 311. θεὸς ἐνομίσθη παρὰ τοῖς Ἑλλησι: Theodektês ap. Aristot. Pol. i. 2, 19. Θελων ἀπ' ἀμφοῖν ἵκυγονον βίζωμάτων.

² Euripid. Troad. 982 seq.; Lycophrôn ap. Steph. Byz. v. Αἴγυς; Stesichorus ap. Schol. Eurip. Orest. 239; Fragm. 9 and 10 of the Ιλίου Πέρσις, Schneidewin—

Οὐνεκα Τυνδάρεως ἥζων ἀπάσι θεοῖς μιᾶς λάθετ' ἡπιοδώρου
Κύπριδος· κείνα δὲ Τυνδάρεων κούραισι χολωσάμενα
Διγάμους τριγάμους τίθησι
Καὶ λιπεσανορας

Further

... 'Ελένη ἐκούσ' ἀπῆρε, &c.

He had probably contrasted her with other females carried away by force.

Stesichorus also affirmed that Iphigeneia was the daughter of Helen by Theseus, born at Argos before her marriage with Menelaus and made over to Klytæmnêstra; this tale was perpetuated by the temple of Eileithyia at Argos, which the Argeians affirmed to have been erected by Helen (Pausan. ii. 22, 7). The ages ascribed by Hellanikus and other logographers (Hellan. Fr. 74) to Theseus and Helen—he fifty years of age and she a child of seven—when he carried her off to Aphidnæ, can never have been the original form of any poetical legend. These ages were probably imagined in order to make the mythical chronology run smoothly; for Theseus belongs to the generation before the Trojan war. But we ought always to recollect that Helen never grows old (*τὴν γὰρ φάτις ίμμεν* ἀγήρω—Quint. Smyr. x. 312), and that her chronology consists only with an immortal being. Servius observes (ad Aeneid. ii. 601)—“Helenam *immortalem* fuisse indicat tempus. Nam constat fratres ejus cum Argonautis fuisse. Argonautarum filii cum Thebanis (Thebano Eteoclis et Polynicis bello) dimicaverunt. Item illorum filii contra Trojan bella gesserunt. Ergo, si *immortalis* Helena non fuisse, tot sine dubio seculis durare non posset.” So Xenophon, after enumerating many heroes of different ages, all pupils of Cheirôn, says that the life of Cheirôn suffices for all, he being brother of Zeus (De Venatione, c. 1).

The daughters of Tyndareus are Klytæmnêstra, Helen, and Timandra, all open to the charge advanced by Stesichorus: see about Timandra, wife of the Tegeate Echemus, the new fragment of the Hesiodic Catalogue, recently restored by Geel (Götting. Pref. Hesiod. p. lxi.).

It is curious to read, in Bayle's article *Hélène*, his critical discussion of the adventures ascribed to her—as if they were genuine matter of history, more or less correctly reported.

formally retracting the calumny, was permitted to recover his sight. In his poem of recantation (the famous palinode now unfortunately lost) he pointedly contradicted the Homeric narrative, affirming that Helen had never been at Troy at all, and that the Trojans had carried thither nothing but her image or *eidolon*.¹ It is, probably, to the excited religious feelings of Stesichorus that we owe the first idea of this glaring deviation from the old legend, which could never have been recommended by any considerations of poetical interest.

Other versions were afterwards started, forming a sort of compromise between Homer and Stesichorus, admitting that Helen had never really been at Troy, without altogether denying her elopement. Such is the story of her having been detained in Egypt during the whole term of the siege. Paris, on his departure from Sparta, had been driven thither by storms, and the Egyptian king Prôteus, hearing of the grievous wrong which he had committed towards Menelaus, had sent him away from the country with severe menaces, detaining Helen until her lawful husband should come to seek her. When the Greeks reclaimed Helen from Troy, the Trojans assured them solemnly, that she neither was nor ever had been, in the town; but the Greeks, treating this allegation as fraudulent, prosecuted the siege until their ultimate success confirmed the correctness of the statement. Menelaus did not recover Helen until, on his return from Troy, he visited Egypt.² Such was the story told by the Egyptian priests to

¹ Plato, Republic. ix. p. 587. c. 10. οὐστερ τὸ τῆς Ἐλένης εἰδώλον Στησίχορος φησι περιμάχητον γένεσθαι ἐν Τροίῃ, ἀγνοιά τοῦ ἀλήθευτος.

Isokrat. Encom. Helen. t. ii. p. 370, Auger; Plato, Phædr. c. 44, p. 243-244; Max. Tyr. Diss. xi. p. 320, Davis; Conón, Narr. 18; Dio Chrysost. Or. xi. p. 323. Τὸν μὲν Στησίχορον ἐν τῇ οὔστερον ὡδῆ λέγειν, ὡς τὸ παράπαν οὐδὲ πλεύσειν ἡ Ἐλένη οὐδάμοσε. Horace, Od. i. 17; Epop. xvii. 42—

"Infamis Helenæ Castor offensus vice,
Fraterque magni Castoris, victi prece,
Adempta vati reddidere lumina."

Pausan. iii. 19, 5. Virgil, surveying the war from the point of view of the Trojans, had no motive to look upon Helen with particular tenderness: Deiphobus imputes to her the basest treachery (*Aeneid*, vi. 511, "scelus exitalle Lacæna;" compare ii. 567).

² Herodot. ii. 120. οὐ γὰρ δὴ οὕτω γε φρενοβλαβῆς ήν δ Πρίαμος, οὐδὲ οὐλλοι προσήκουτες αὐτῷ, &c. The passage is too long to cite, but is highly curious: not the least remarkable part is the religious colouring which he gives to the new version of the story which he is adopting,—"the Trojans, though they had not got Helen, yet could not persuade the Greeks that this was the fact; for it was the divine will that they should be destroyed root and branch, in order to make it plain to mankind that upon great crimes the gods inflict great punishments."

Herodotus, and it appeared satisfactory to his historicising mind. "For if Helen had really been at Troy (he argues) she would certainly have been given up, even had she been mistress of Priam himself instead of Paris: the Trojan king, with all his family and all his subjects, would never knowingly have incurred utter and irretrievable destruction for the purpose of retaining her: their misfortune was, that while they did not possess, and therefore could not restore her, they yet found it impossible to convince the Greeks that such was the fact." Assuming the historical character of the war of Troy, the remark of Herodotus admits of no reply; nor can we greatly wonder that he acquiesced in the tale of Helen's Egyptian detention, as a substitute for the "incredible insanity" which the genuine legend imputes to Priam and the Trojans. Pausanias, upon the same ground and by the same mode of reasoning, pronounced that the Trojan horse must have been in point of fact a battering-engine, because to admit the literal narrative would be to impute utter childishness to the defenders of the city. And Mr. Payne Knight rejects Helen altogether as the real cause of the Trojan war, though she may have been the pretext of it; for he thinks that neither the Greeks nor the Trojans could have been so mad and silly as to endure calamities of such magnitude "for one little woman."¹ Mr. Knight suggests various political causes as substitutes; these might deserve consideration, either if any evidence could be produced to countenance them, or if the subject on which they are brought to bear could be shown to belong to the domain of history.

The return of the Grecian chiefs from Troy furnished matter to the ancient epic hardly less copious than the siege itself, and the more susceptible of indefinite diversity, inasmuch as

Dio Chrysostom (Or. xi. p. 333) reasons in the same way as Herodotus against the credibility of the received narrative. On the other hand, Isokratēs, in extolling Helen, dwells on the calamities of the Trojan war as a test of the peerless value of the prize (Encom. Hel. p. 360, Aug.): in the view of Pindar (Olymp. xiii. 56) as well as in that of Hesiod (Opp. Di. 165), Helen is the one prize contended for.

Euripidēs, in his tragedy of Helen, recognises the detention of Helen in Egypt and the presence of her *εἴδωλον* at Troy, but he follows Stesichorus in denying her elopement altogether,—Hermes had carried her to Egypt in a cloud (Helen 35-45, 706): compare Von Hoff, *De Mytho Helenæ Euripideæ*, cap. 2, p. 35 (Leyden, 1843).

¹ Pausan. i. 23, 8; Payne Knight, *Prolegg. ad Homer. c. 53*. Euphorion construed the wooden horse into a Grecian ship called "Ιππός, " *The Horse* (Euphorion, *Fragm. 34*, ap. Dünzter, *Fragm. Epicc. Græc. p. 55*).

See Thucyd. i. 12; vi. 2.

those who had before acted in concert were now dispersed and isolated. Moreover the stormy voyages and compulsory wanderings of the heroes exactly fell in with the common aspirations after an heroic founder, and enabled even the most remote Hellenic settlers to connect the origin of their town with this prominent event of their ante-historical and semi-divine world. And an absence of ten years afforded room for the supposition of many domestic changes in their native abode, and many family misfortunes and misdeeds during the interval. One of these heroic "Returns," that of Odysseus, has been immortalised by the verse of Homer. The hero, after a series of long-protracted suffering and expatriation, inflicted on him by the anger of Poseidôn, at last reaches his native island, but finds his wife beset, his youthful son insulted, and his substance plundered, by a troop of insolent suitors; he is forced to appear as a wretched beggar, and to endure in his own person their scornful treatment; but finally, by the interference of Athênê coming in aid of his own courage and stratagem, he is enabled to overwhelm his enemies, to resume his family position, and to recover his property. The return of several other Grecian chiefs was the subject of an epic poem by Hagias, which is now lost, but of which a brief abstract or argument still remains: there were in antiquity various other poems of similar title and analogous matter.¹

As usual with the ancient epic, the multiplied sufferings of this back-voyage are traced to divine wrath, justly provoked by the sins of the Greeks; who, in the fierce exultation of a victory purchased by so many hardships, had neither respected nor even² spared the altars of the gods in Troy. Athênê, who had been their most zealous ally during the siege, was so incensed by their final recklessness, more especially by the outrage of Ajax, son of Oileus, that she actively harassed and embittered their return, in spite of every effort to appease her. The chiefs began to quarrel among themselves: their formal assembly became a scene of drunkenness; even Agamemnôn and Menelaus lost their fraternal harmony, and each man acted on his own separate resolution.³ Nevertheless, according to the *Odyssey*, Nestôr, Diomêdês, Neoptolemus, Idomeneus and Philoktêtês, reached home speedily and safely; Agamemnôn

¹ Suidas, v. *Νόστος*. Wüllner, *De Cyclo Epico*, p. 93. Also a poem *Ἀργειδῶν καθόδος* (Athenæ. vii. p. 281).

² Upon this the turn of fortune in Grecian affairs depends (Æschyl. *Agamemn.* 338; *Odyss.* iii. 130; Euripid. *Troad.* 69-95).

³ *Odyss.* iii. 130-161; Æschyl. *Agamemn.* 650-662.

also arrived in Peloponnēsus, to perish by the hand of a treacherous wife; but Menelaus was condemned to long wanderings and to the severest privations in Egypt, Cyprus and elsewhere, before he could set foot in his native land. The Lokrian Ajax perished on the Gyraean rock.¹ Though exposed to a terrible storm, he had already reached this place of safety, when he indulged in the rash boast of having escaped in defiance of the gods. No sooner did Poseidōn hear this language, than he struck with his trident the rock which Ajax was grasping and precipitated both into the sea.² Kalchas the soothsayer, together with Leonteus and Polypōtēs, proceeded by land from Troy to Kolophon.³

In respect however to these and other Grecian heroes, tales were told different from those in the *Odyssey*, assigning to them a long expatriation and a distant home. Nestōr went to Italy, where he founded Metapontum, Pisa and Hérakleia :⁴ Philoktētēs⁵ also went to Italy, founded Petilia and Krimisa, and sent settlers to Egesta in Sicily. Neoptolemus, under the advice of Thetis, marched by land across Thrace, met with Odysseus, who had come by sea, at Maroneia, and then pursued his journey to Epirus, where he became king of the Molossians.⁶ Idomeneus came to Italy, and founded Uria in the Salentine peninsula. Diomédēs, after wandering far and wide, went along the Italian coast into the innermost Adriatic gulf, and

¹ *Odyss.* iii. 188–196; iv. 5–87. The Egyptian city of Kanopus, at the mouth of the Nile, was believed to have taken its name from the pilot of Menelaus, who had died and was buried there (Strabo, xvii. p. 801; Tacit. Ann. ii. 60). *Μενέλαιος νόμος*, so called after Menelaus (Dio Chrysost. xi. p. 361).

² *Odyss.* iv. 500. The epic *Νόστοι* of Hagias placed this adventure of Ajax on the rocks of Kaphareus, a southern promontory of Eubœa (Argum. *Νόστοι*, p. 23, Dūntzer). Deceptive lights were kindled on the dangerous rocks by Nauplius, the father of Palamēdēs, in revenge for the death of his son (Sophoklēs, *Ναύπλιος Πυρκαεὺς*, a lost tragedy; Hygin. f. 116; Senec. *Agamemn.* 567).

³ Argument. *Νόστοι*, *ut sup.* There were monuments of Kalchas near Sipontum in Italy also (Strabo, vi. p. 284), as well as at Selgē in Pisidia (Strabo, xii. p. 570).

⁴ Strabo, v. p. 222; vi. p. 264. Vellei. Paterc. i. 1; Servius ad *AEn.* x. 179. He had built a temple to Athēnē in the island of Keōs (Strabo, x. 487).

⁵ Strabo, vi. pp. 254, 272; Virgil, *AEn.* iii. 401, and Servius *ad loc.*; Lycophrōn, 912.

Both the tomb of Philoktētēs and the arrows of Héraklēs which he had used against Troy, were for a long time shown at Thurium (Justin, xx. 1).

⁶ Argument. *Νόστοι*, p. 23, Dūntz.; Pindar, *Nem.* iv. 51. According to Pindar, however, Neoptolemus comes from Troy by sea, misses the island of Skyrus, and sails round to the Epeirotic Ephyra (*Nem.* vii. 37).

finally settled in Daunia, founding the cities of Argyrippa, Beneventum, Atria and Diomèdeia: by the favour of Athénê he became immortal, and was worshipped as a god in many different places.¹ The Lokrian followers of Ajax founded the Epizephyrian Lokri on the southernmost corner of Italy,² besides another settlement in Libya. I have spoken in another place of the compulsory exile of Teukros, who besides founding the city of Salamis in Cyprus, is said to have established some settlements in the Iberian peninsula.³ Menestheus the Athenian did the like, and also founded both Elæa in Mysia and Skylletium in Italy.⁴ The Arcadian chief Agapenôr founded Paphus in Cyprus.⁵ Epeius, of Panopeus in Phôkis, the constructor of the Trojan horse with the aid of the goddess Athénê, settled at Lagaria near Sybaris on the coast of Italy; and the very tools which he had employed in that remarkable fabric were shown down to a late date in the temple of Athénê at Metapontum.⁶ Temples, altars and towns were also pointed out in Asia Minor, in Samos and in Krête, the foundation of Agamemnôn or of his followers.⁷ The inhabitants of the Grecian town of Skionê, in the Thracian peninsula called Pallénê or Pellénê, accounted themselves the offspring of the Pellénians from Achæa in Peloponnêsus, who had served under Agamemnôn before Troy, and who on their return from the

¹ Pindar, *Nem.* x. 7, with the Scholia. Strabo, iii. p. 150; v. p. 214-215; vi. p. 284. Stephan. Byz. Ἀργύριππα, Διομηδεῖα. Aristotle recognises him as buried in the Diomedean islands in the Adriatic (Anthol. Gr. Brunck. i. p. 178).

The identical tripod which had been gained by Diomêdês, as victor in the chariot-race at the funeral games of Patroklos, was shown at Delphi in the time of Phanias, attested by an inscription, as well as the dagger which had been worn by Helikaôn, son of Antenôr (Athenea. vi. p. 232).

² Virgil, *Aeneid*, iii. 399; xi. 265; and Servius, *ibid.* Ajax, the son of Oïleus, was worshipped there as a hero (Conôn. *Narr.* 18).

³ Strabo, iii. p. 157; Isokratês, *Evagor. Encom.* p. 192; Justin. xliv. 3. Ajax, the son of Teukros, established a temple of Zeus, and an hereditary priesthood always held by his descendants (who mostly bore the name of Ajax or Teukros), at Olbê in Kilikia (Strabo, xiv. p. 672). Teukros carried with him his Trojan captives to Cyprus (Athenea. vi. p. 256).

⁴ Strabo, iii. p. 140-150; vi. p. 261; xiii. p. 622. See the epitaphs on Teukros and Agapenôr by Aristotle (Antholog. Gr. ed. Brunck. i. p. 179-180).

⁵ Strabo, xiv. p. 683; Pausan. viii. 5, 2.

⁶ Strabo, vi. p. 263; Justin, xx. 2; Aristot. *Mirab. Ausc.* c. 108. Also the epigram of the Rhodian Simmias called Πελεκύς (Antholog. Gr. Brunck. i. p. 210).

⁷ Vellei. *Patercul.* i. 1. Stephan. Byz. v. Λάδηπη. Strabo, xiii. p. 605; xiv. p. 639. Theopompus (Fragm. 111, Didot) recounted that Agamemnôn and his followers had possessed themselves of the larger portion of Cyprus.

siege had been driven on the spot by a storm and there settled.¹ The Pamphylians, on the southern coast of Asia Minor, deduced their origin from the wanderings of Amphilochus and Kalchas after the siege of Troy: the inhabitants of the Amphilochian Argos on the Gulf of Ambrakia revered the same Amphilochus as their founder.² The Orchomenians under Ialmenus, on quitting the conquered city, wandered or were driven to the eastern extremity of the Euxine Sea; and the barbarous Achaeans under Mount Caucasus were supposed to have derived their first establishment from this source.³ Merionê with his Krêtan followers settled at Engyion in Sicily, along with the preceding Krêtans who had remained there after the invasion of Minôs. The Elymians in Sicily also were composed of Trojans and Greeks separately driven to the spot, who, forgetting their previous differences, united in the joint settlements of Eryx and Egesta.⁴ We hear of Podaleirius both in Italy and on the coast of Karia;⁵ of Akamas, son of Thêseus, at Amphipolis in Thrace, at Soli in Cyprus, and at Synnada in Phrygia;⁶ of Guneus, Prothous and Euryppylus, in Krête as well as in Libya.⁷ The obscure poem of Lycophrôn enumerates many of these dispersed and expatriated heroes, whose conquest of Troy was indeed a Kadmeian victory (according to the proverbial phrase of the Greeks), wherein the sufferings of the victor were little inferior to those of the vanquished.⁸ It was particularly among the Italian Greeks, where they were worshipped with very special solemnity, that their presence as wanderers from Troy was reported and believed.⁹

¹ Thucyd. iv. 120.

² Herodot. vii. 91; Thucyd. ii. 68. According to the old elegiac poet Kallinos, Kalchas himself had died at Klarus near Kolophôn, after his march from Troy, but Mopsus, his rival in the prophetic function, had conducted his followers into Pamphylia and Kilikia (Strabo, xii. p. 570; xiv. p. 668). The oracle of Amphilochus at Mallus in Kilikia bore the highest character for exactness and truth-telling in the time of Pausanias, *μαντεῖον ἀψευδέστατον τῶν ἐν' ἐμοῦ* (Paus. i. 34, 2). Another story recognised Leontius and Polycötê as the founders of Aspendus in Kilikia (Eustath. ad Iliad. ii. 138).

³ Strabo, ix. p. 416.

⁴ Diodôr. iv. 79; Thucyd. vi. 2.

⁵ Stephan. Byz. v. Σύρνα; Lycophrôn, 1047.

⁶ Äschines, De Falsâ Legat. c. 14; Strabo, xiv. p. 683; Stephan. Byz. v. Σύνναδα.

⁷ Lycophrôn, 877-902, with Scholia; Apollodôr. Fragm. p. 386, Heyne. There is also a long enumeration of these returning wanderers and founders of new settlements in Solinus (Polyhist. c. 2).

⁸ Strabo, iii. p. 150.

⁹ Aristot. Mirabil. Auscult. 79, 106, 107, 109, 111.

I pass over the numerous other tales which circulated among the ancients, illustrating the ubiquity of the Grecian and Trojan heroes as well as that of the Argonauts,—one of the most striking features in the Hellenic legendary world.¹ Amongst them all, the most interesting, individually, is Odysseus, whose romantic adventures in fabulous places and among fabulous persons have been made familiarly known by Homer. The goddesses Kalypso and Circē; the semi-divine mariners of Phæacia, whose ships are endowed with consciousness and obey without a steersman; the one-eyed Cyclops, the gigantic Lastrygonés, and the wind-ruler Æolus; the Sirens who ensnare by their song, as the Lotophagi fascinate by their food—all these pictures formed integral and interesting portions of the old epic. Homer leaves Odysseus re-established in his house and family. But so marked a personage could never be permitted to remain in the tameness of domestic life: the epic poem called the Telegonia ascribed so him a subsequent series of adventures. Telegonus, his son by Circē, coming to Ithaka in search of his father, ravaged the island and killed Odysseus without knowing who he was. Bitter repentance overtook the son for his undesigned parricide: at his prayer and by the intervention of his mother Circē, both Penelopē and Tēlemachus were made immortal; Telegonus married Penelopē, and Tēlemachus married Circē.²

We see by this poem that Odysseus was represented as the mythical ancestor of the Thesprotian kings, just as Neoptolemus was of the Molossian.

It has already been mentioned that Antenor and Æneas stand distinguished from the other Trojans by a dissatisfaction with Priam and a sympathy with the Greeks, which is by Sophoklēs and others construed as treacherous collusion,³—a

¹ Strabo, i. p. 48. After dwelling emphatically on the long voyages of Dionysus, Hēraklēs, Jasōn, Odysseus, and Menelaus, he says, Αἰνεῖαν δὲ καὶ Ἀντήνορα καὶ Ἐνετού, καὶ ἀπλῶς τοὺς ἐκ τοῦ Τρωϊκοῦ πολέμου πλανηθέντας εἰς πᾶσαν τὴν οἰκουμένην, ζειον μὴ τῶν παλαιῶν ἀνθρώπων νομίσαι; Συνέβη γὰρ δὴ τοῖς τότε Ἑλλησιν, δμοῖς καὶ τοῖς βαρβάροις, διὰ τὸν τῆς στρατείας χρόνον, ἀποβαλεῖν τά τε ἐν οἴκῳ καὶ τὴν στρατεία πορισθέντα. Ωστε μετὰ τὴν τοῦ Ἰλίου καταστροφὴν τούς τε νικήσαντας ἐπὶ λρυτείαν τραπέσθαι διὰ τὰς ἀποριας, καὶ πολλῷ μᾶλλον τοὺς ἡττηθέντας καὶ περιγενομένους ἐκ τοῦ πολέμου. Καὶ δὴ καὶ πόλεις ὑπὸ τούτων κτισθῆναι λέγονται κατὰ πᾶσαν τὴν έξω τῆς Ἑλλάδος παραλίαν, έστι δὲ ὅπου καὶ τὴν μεσόγαιαν.

² The Telegonia, composed by Eugammōn of Kyrēnē, is lost, but the Argument of it has been preserved by Proclus (p. 25, Dūntzer; Diktyς, vi. 15).

³ Dionys. Hal. i. 46-48; Sophokl. ap. Strab. xiii. p. 608; Livy, i. 1; Xenophon, Venat. i. 15.

suspicion indirectly glanced at, though emphatically repelled, by the *Aeneas* of Virgil.¹ In the old epic of Arktinus, next in age to the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, *Aeneas* abandons Troy and retires to Mount Ida, in terror at the miraculous death of Laocoön, before the entry of the Greeks into the town and the last night-battle: yet Leschēs, in another of the ancient epic poems, represented him as having been carried away captive by Neoptolemus.² In a remarkable passage of the *Iliad*, Poseidōn describes the family of Priam as having incurred the hatred of Zeus, and predicts that *Aeneas* and his descendants shall reign over the Trojans: the race of Dardanus, beloved by Zeus more than all his other sons, would thus be preserved, since *Aeneas* belonged to it. Accordingly, when *Aeneas* is in imminent peril from the hands of Achilles, Poseidōn specially interferes to rescue him, and even the implacable miso-Trojan goddess Hērē assents to the proceeding.³ These passages have been construed by various able critics to refer to a family of philo-Hellenic or semi-Hellenic *Aeneadæ*, known even in the time of the early singers of the *Iliad* as masters of some territory in or near the Troad, and professing to be descended from, as well as worshipping, *Aeneas*. In the town of Skēpsis, situated in the mountainous range of Ida, about thirty miles eastward of Ilium, there existed two noble and priestly families who professed to be descended, the one from Hectōr, the other from *Aeneas*. The Skēpsian critic Dēmētrius (in whose time both

¹ *AEn.* ii. 433.

² Argument of 'Ιλίου Πέρσις; *Fragm.* 7, of Leschēs, in Dūntzer's Collection, p. 19-21.

Hellenikus seems to have adopted this retirement of *Aeneas* to the strongest parts of Mount Ida, but to have reconciled it with the stories of the migration of *Aeneas*, by saying that he only remained in Ida a little time, and then quitted the country altogether by virtue of a convention concluded with the Greeks (*Dionys.* *Hal.* i. 47-48). Among the infinite variety of stories respecting this hero, one was, that after having effected his settlement in Italy, he had returned to Troy and resumed the sceptre, bequeathing it at his death to Ascanius (*Dionys.* *Hal.* i. 53): this was a comprehensive scheme for apparently reconciling *all* the legends.

³ *Iliad*, xx. 300. Poseidōn speaks, respecting *Aeneas*—

'Αλλ' ἄγεθ', ἡμεῖς πέρ μιν ὑπ' ἵκ θανάτου ἀγάγωμεν,
Μήτος καὶ Κρονίδης κεχολώστεται, αἰκεν Ἀχιλλεὺς
Τόνδε κατακτεῖντι μόριμον δέ οἱ ἔστ' ἀλέασθαι,
Οφρα μὴ ἀστερίος γενεὴ καὶ ἄφαντος ὅληται
Δαρδάνου, ὃν Κρονίδης περὶ πάντων φίλατο παῖδων,
Οι ἔντες ἐξεγένοντο, γυναικῶντες θυητάων.
Ηδη γάρ Πριάμου γενεὴν ἡχθρος Κρονίων·
Νῦν δέ οἱ Αἰγαίοι βίν Τρώεσσιν ἀνάστη,
Καὶ παῖδων παῖδες, τοί κεν μετόπισθε γένεωνται.'

Again, v. 339, Poseidōn tells *Aeneas* that he has nothing to dread from any other Greek than Achilles.

these families were still to be found) informs us that Skamandrius son of Hectôr, and Ascanius son of Æneas, were the archegets or heroic founders of his native city, which had been originally situated on one of the highest ranges of Ida, and was subsequently transferred by them to the less lofty spot on which it stood in his time.¹ In Arisbê and Gentinus there seem to have been families professing the same descent, since the same archegets were acknowledged.² In Ophrynum, Hectôr had his consecrated edifice, while in Ilium both he and Æneas were worshipped as gods:³ and it was the remarkable statement of the Lesbian Menekratê, that Æneas, "having been wronged by Paris and stripped of the sacred privileges which belonged to him, avenged himself by betraying the city, and then became one of the Greeks."⁴

One tale thus among many respecting Æneas, and that too the most ancient of all, preserved among natives of the Troad, who worshipped him as their heroic ancestor, was, that after the capture of Troy he continued in the country as king of the remaining Trojans, on friendly terms with the Greeks. But there were other tales respecting him, alike numerous and irreconcileable: the hand of destiny marked him as a wanderer (*fato profugus*), and his ubiquity is not exceeded even by that of Odysseus. We hear of him at Ænus in Thrace, in Pallêne, at Æneia in the Thermaic Gulf, in Delus, at Orchomenus and Mantinea in Arcadia, in the islands of Kythêra and Zakynthus, in Leukas and Ambrakia, at Buthrotum in Epirus, on the Salentine peninsula and various other places in the southern region of Italy; at Drepana and Segesta in Sicily, at Carthage, at Cape Palinurus, Cumæ, Misenum, Caieta, and finally in Latium, where he lays the first humble foundation of the

¹ See O. Müller, on the causes of the mythe of Æneas and his voyage to Italy, in Classical Journal, vol. xxvi. p. 308; Klausen, *Æneas und die Penaten*, vol. i. p. 43-52.

Dêmêtrius Skêps. ap. Strab. xiii. p. 607; Nicolaus ap. Steph. Byz. v. *Ἀσκανία*. Dêmêtrius conjectured that Skêpsis had been the regal seat of Æneas: there was a village called Æneia near to it (Strabo, xiii. p. 603).

² Steph. Byz. v. *Ἀρισβη, Γεντινός*. Ascanius is king of Ida after the departure of the Greeks (Conðn, Narr. 41; Mela, i. 18). *Ascanius portus* between Phokæa and Kymê.

³ Strabo, xiii. p. 595; Lycophrôn, 1208, and Sch.; Athenagoras, Legat. I. Inscription in Clarke's Travels, vol. ii. p. 86, *Οἱ Ἰλιεῖς τὸν πάτριον θεὸν Αἰνελαν*. Lucian. Deor. Concil. c. 12. i. III, p. 534, Hemst.

⁴ Menekrat. ap. Dionys. Hal. i. 48. *Ἄχαιοὺς δὲ ἀνήνεκτοι εἰχε* (after the burial) *καὶ ἐδόκεον τῆς στρατῆς τὴν κεφαλὴν ἀπηράχθαι.* *Ομως δὲ τάφον* *ἀντῷ δασσαντες, ἐπολέμεον γῆ τάσσον, ἔχρις Ἰλιος ἐδλω, Αἰνείων ἐνδόντος.* *Αἰνείης γὰρ ἄπιτος ἐὸν ὅπελον Ἀλεξάνδρου, καὶ ἀπὸ γερέων ἵερῶν ἀξειργύμενος,* *ἀνέτρεψε Πριαμον, ἐργασάμενος δὲ ταῦτα, εἰς Ἀχαιῶν ἐγεγόνει.*

mighty Rome and her empire.¹ And the reason why his wanderings were not continued still further was, that the oracles and the pronounced will of the gods directed him to settle in Latium.² In each of these numerous places his visit was commemorated and certified by local monuments or special legends, particularly by temples and permanent ceremonies in honour of his mother Aphrodítē, whose worship accompanied him everywhere: there were also many temples and many different tombs of Æneas himself.³ The vast ascendancy acquired by Rome, the ardour with which all the literary Romans espoused the idea of a Trojan origin, and the fact that the Julian family recognised Æneas as their gentile primary ancestor,—all contributed to give to the Roman version of this legend the preponderance over every other. The various other places, in which monuments of Æneas were found, came thus to be represented as places where he had halted for a time on his way from Troy to Latium. But though the legendary pretensions of these places were thus eclipsed in the eyes of those who constituted the literary public, the local belief was not extinguished; they claimed the hero as their permanent property, and his tomb was to them a proof that he had lived and died among them.

Antenôr, who shares with Æneas the favourable sympathy of the Greeks, is said by Pindar to have gone from Troy along with Menelaus and Helen into the region of Kyrêne in Libya.⁴ But according to the more current narrative, he placed himself at the head of a body of Eneti or Veneti from Paphlagonia, who had come as allies of Troy, and went by sea into the inner part of the Adriatic Gulf, where he conquered the neighbouring

¹ Dionys. Halic. A. R. i. 48-54; Heyne, Excurs. 1 ad *Æneid.* iii. : De *Æneæ Erroribus*, and Excurs. 1 ad *Æn.* v.; Conôn, Narr. 46; Livy, xl. 4; Stephan. Byz. *Ἄντενα*. The inhabitants of *Æneia* in the Thermaic Gulf worshipped him with great solemnity as their heroic founder (Pausan. iii. 22, 4; viii. 12, 4). The tomb of Anchisê was shown on the confines of the Arcadian Orchomenus and Mantinea (compare Steph. Byz. v. *Κάρφων*), under the mountain called Anchisia, near a temple of Aphrodítē: on the discrepancies respecting the death of Anchisê (Heyne, Excurs. 17 ad *Æn.* iii.): Segesta in Sicily founded by Æneas (Cicero, *Verr.* iv. 33).

² Τοῦ δὲ μηκέτι προσωτέρω τῆς Εὐρώπης πλεῦνσαι τὸν Τρωϊκὸν στόλον, εἴ τε χρησμοὶ ἔγενοντο αἵτιοι, &c. (Dionys. Hal. i. 55.)

³ Dionys. Hal. i. 54. Among other places, his tomb was shown at Berecynthia, in Phrygia (Festus v. *Romam*, p. 224, ed. Müller): a curious article, which contains an assemblage of the most contradictory statements respecting both Æneas and Latinus.

⁴ Pindar, Pyth. v., and the citation from the *Νόστοι* of Lysimachus in the Scholia; given still more fully in the Scholia ad *Lycophrôn*. 875. There was a λόφος *Ἀντηνορίδων* at Kyrêne.

barbarians and founded the town of *Patavium* (the modern *Padua*) ; the *Veneti* in this region were said to owe their origin to his immigration.¹ We learn further from *Strabo*, that *Opsikellas*, one of the companions of *Antenôr*, had continued his wanderings even into *Ibêria*, and that he had there established a settlement bearing his name.²

Thus endeth the Trojan war, together with its sequel, the dispersion of the heroes, victors as well as vanquished. The account here given of it has been unavoidably brief and imperfect ; for in a work intended to follow consecutively the real history of the Greeks, no greater space can be allotted even to the most splendid gem of their legendary period. Indeed, although it would be easy to fill a large volume with the separate incidents which have been introduced into the "Trojan cycle," the misfortune is that they are for the most part so contradictory as to exclude all possibility of weaving them into one connected narrative. We are compelled to select one out of the number, generally without any solid ground of preference, and then to note the variations of the rest. No one who has not studied the original documents can imagine the extent to which this discrepancy proceeds : it covers almost every portion and fragment of the tale.³

But though much may have been thus omitted of what the reader might expect to find in an account of the Trojan war, its genuine character has been studiously preserved, without either exaggeration or abatement. The real Trojan war is that which was recounted by *Homer* and the old epic poets, and continued by all the lyric and tragic composers. For the latter, though they took great liberties with the particular incidents, and introduced to some extent a new moral tone, yet worked more or less faithfully on the Homeric scale ; and even *Euripidês*, who departed the most widely from the feelings of the old legend, never lowered down his matter to the analogy of contemporary life. They preserved its well-defined object, at once righteous and romantic, the recovery of the daughter of *Zeus* and sister of the *Dioskuri*—its mixed agencies,

¹ *Livy*, i. 1. *Servius*, *ad Aeneid.* i. 242. *Strabo*, i. 48 ; v. 212. *Ovid*, *Fasti*, iv. 75.

² *Strabo*, iii. p. 157.

³ These diversities are well set forth in the useful *Dissertation of Fuchs*, *De Varietate Fabularum Troicarum* (*Cologne*, 1830).

Of the number of romantic statements put forth respecting *Helen* and *Achilles* especially, some idea may be formed from the fourth, fifth and sixth chapters of *Ptolemy Hêphaestion* (*apud Westermann, Script. Mythograph.* p. 188, &c.).

divine, heroic and human—the colossal force and deeds of its chief actors—its vast magnitude and long duration, as well as the toils which the conquerors underwent, and the Nemesis which followed upon their success. And these were the circumstances which, set forth in the full blaze of epic and tragic poetry, bestowed upon the legend its powerful and imperishable influence over the Hellenic mind. The enterprise was one comprehending all the members of the Hellenic body, of which each individually might be proud, and in which, nevertheless, those feelings of jealous and narrow patriotism, so lamentably prevalent in many of the towns, were as much as possible excluded. It supplied them with a grand and inexhaustible object of common sympathy, common faith, and common admiration ; and when occasions arose for bringing together a Pan-Hellenic force against the barbarians, the precedent of the Homeric expedition was one upon which the elevated minds of Greece could dwell with the certainty of rousing an unanimous impulse, if not always of counterworking sinister by-motives, among their audience. And the incidents comprised in the Trojan cycle were familiarised, not only to the public mind, but also to the public eye, by innumerable representations both of the sculptor and the painter,—those which were romantic and chivalrous being better adapted for this purpose, and therefore more constantly employed, than any other.

Of such events the genuine Trojan war of the old epic was for the most part composed. Though literally believed, reverentially cherished, and numbered among the gigantic phænomena of the past, by the Grecian public, it is in the eyes of modern inquiry essentially a legend and nothing more. If we are asked whether it be not a legend embodying portions of historical matter, and raised upon a basis of truth,—whether there may not really have occurred at the foot of the hill of Ilium a war purely human and political, without gods, without heroes, without Helen, without Amazons, without Ethiopians under the beautiful son of Eôs, without the wooden horse, without the characteristic and expressive features of the old epical war,—like the mutilated trunk of Deiphobus in the under-world ; if we are asked whether there was not really some such historical Trojan war as this, our answer must be, that as the possibility of it cannot be denied, so neither can the reality of it be affirmed. We possess nothing but the ancient epic itself without any independent evidence : had it been an age of records indeed, the Homeric epic in its exquisite

and unsuspecting simplicity would probably never have come into existence. Whoever therefore ventures to dissect Homer, Arktinus, and Leschés, and to pick out certain portions as matters of fact, while he sets aside the rest as fiction, must do so in full reliance on his own powers of historical divination, without any means either of proving or verifying his conclusions. Among many attempts, ancient as well as modern, to identify real objects in this historical darkness, that of Dio Chrysostom deserves attention for its extraordinary boldness. In his oration addressed to the inhabitants of Ilium, and intended to demonstrate that the Trojans were not only blameless as to the origin of the war, but victorious in its issue—he overthrows all the leading points of the Homeric narrative, and re-writes nearly the whole from beginning to end: Paris is the lawful husband of Helen, Achilles is slain by Hectôr, and the Greeks retire without taking Troy, disgraced as well as baffled. Having shown without difficulty, that the Iliad, if it be looked at as a history, is full of gaps, incongruities and absurdities, he proceeds to compose a more plausible narrative of his own, which he tenders as so much authentic matter of fact. The most important point, however, which his Oration brings to view is, the literal and confiding belief with which the Homeric narrative was regarded, as if it were actual history, not only by the inhabitants of Ilium, but also by the general Grecian public.¹

The small town of Ilium, inhabited by Æolic Greeks,² and raised into importance only by the legendary reverence attached to it, stood upon an elevated ridge forming a spur from Mount Ida, rather more than three miles from the town and promontory of Sigeium, and about twelve stadia, or less than two miles, from the sea at its nearest point. From Sigeium and the neighbouring town of Achilleum (with its monument and temple of Achilles), to the town of Rhœteum on a hill higher up the Hellespont (with its monument and chapel of Ajax called the Aianteum),³ was a distance of sixty stadia, or about seven

¹ Dio Chrysost. Or. xi. p. 310–322.

² Herodot. v. 122. Pausan. v. 8, 3; viii. 12, 4. Αἰολεὺς ἐκ πόλεως Τρφαδος, the title proclaimed at the Olympic games: like Αἰολεὺς ἀπὸ Μουρίνας, from Myrina in the more southerly region of Æolis, as we find in the list of victors at the Charitësia, at Orchomenos in Boeotia (Corp. Inscript. Boeckh. No. 1583).

³ See Pausanias, i. 35, 3, for the legends current at Ilium respecting the vast size of the bones of Ajax in his tomb. The inhabitants affirmed that after the shipwreck of Odysseus, the arms of Achilles, which he was carrying away with him, were washed up by the sea against the tomb of Ajax. Pliny gives the distance at thirty stadia: modern travellers make it something more than Pliny, but considerably less than Strabo.

English miles in the straight course by sea : in the intermediate space was a bay and an adjoining plain, comprehending the embouchure of the Skamander, and extending to the base of the ridge on which Ilium stood. This plain was the celebrated plain of Troy, in which the great Homeric battles were believed to have taken place : the portion of the bay near to Sigeum went by the name of the Naustathmon of the Achæans (*i. e.* the spot where they dragged their ships ashore), and was accounted to have been the camp of Agamemnôn and his vast army.¹

Historical Ilium was founded, according to the questionable statement of Strabo, during the last dynasty of the Lydian kings,² that is, at some period later than 720 B.C. Until after the days of Alexander the Great—indeed until the period of Roman preponderance—it always remained a place of inconsiderable power and importance, as we learn not only from the assertion of the geographer, but also from the fact that Achilleum, Sigeum and Rhoeteum were all independent of it.³ But inconsiderable as it might be, it was the only place which ever bore the venerable name immortalised by Homer. Like the Homeric Ilium, it had its temple of Athénê,⁴ wherein she was worshipped as the presiding goddess of the town : the inhabitants affirmed that Agamemnôn had not altogether destroyed the town, but that it had been re-occupied after his departure, and had never ceased to exist.⁵ Their acropolis was called Pergamum, and in it was shown the house of Priam and the

¹ Strabo, xiii. p. 596–598. Strabo distinguishes the 'Αχαιῶν Ναύσταθμον, which was near to Sigeum, from the 'Αχαιῶν λιμήν, which was more towards the middle of the bay between Sigeum and Rhoeteum ; but we gather from his language that this distinction was not universally recognised. Alexander landed at the 'Αχαιῶν λιμήν (Arrian, i. 11).

² Strabo, xiii. p. 593.

³ Herodot. v. 95 (his account of the war between the Athenians and Mitylenæans about Sigeum and Achilleum) ; Strabo, xiii. p. 593. Τὴν δὲ τῶν Ἰλιέων πόλιν τὴν νῦν τέως μὲν κωμόπολιν εἶναι φασι, τὸ δέ τερόν ἔχουσαν τῆς Ἀθηνᾶς μικρὸν καὶ εὐτελές. Ἀλεξανδρὸν δὲ ἀναβάντα μετὰ τὴν ἐπὶ Γραυίκῳ νίκην, ἀναθῆμασί τε κοσμῆσαι τὸ δέρδυ καὶ προσαγορεύσαι πόλιν, &c.

Again, Καὶ τὸ Ἰλιον, οὐ νῦν ἔστι, κωμόπολις τις ἡνὶ δέ τε πρώτον Ρωμαῖοι τῆς Αστᾶς ἐπέβησαν.

⁴ Besides Athénê, the Inscriptions authenticate Ζεὺς Πολιεὺς at Ilium (Corp. Inscr. Boeckh. No. 3599).

⁵ Strabo, xiii. p. 600. Λέγουσι δ' οἱ νῦν Ἰλιέις καὶ τοῦτο, ὡς οὐδὲ τελέως συνέβαντες ἡφαντούσθαι τὴν πόλιν κατὰ τὴν ἄλωσιν ὑπὲ τῶν Ἀχαιῶν, οὐδὲ ἔγγειφθη οἰδέποτε.

The situation of Ilium (or as it is commonly, but erroneously, termed, *New Ilium*) appears to be pretty well ascertained, about two miles from the sea (Rennell, On the Topography of Troy, p. 41–71 ; Dr. Clarke's Travels, vol. ii. p. 102).

altar of Zeus Herkeius where that unhappy old man had been slain. Moreover there were exhibited, in the temples, panoplies which had been worn by the Homeric heroes,¹ and doubtless many other relics appreciated by admirers of the Iliad.

These were testimonies which few persons in those ages were inclined to question, when combined with the identity of name and general locality; nor does it seem that any one did question them until the time of Démétrius of Skêpsis. Hellanikus expressly described this Ilium as being the Ilium of Homer, for which assertion Strabo (or probably Démétrius, from whom the narrative seems to be copied) imputes to him very gratuitously an undue partiality towards the inhabitants of the town.² Herodotus relates, that Xerxes in his march into Greece visited the place, went up to the Pergamum of Priam, inquired with much interest into the details of the Homeric siege, made libations to the fallen heroes, and offered to the Athénê of Ilium his magnificent sacrifice of a thousand oxen: he probably represented and believed himself to be attacking Greece as the avenger of the Priamid family. The Lacedæmonian admiral Mindarus, while his fleet lay at Abydus, went personally to Ilium to offer sacrifice to Athénê, and saw from that elevated spot the battle fought between the squadron of Dorieus and the Athenians, off the shore near Rhœteium.³

¹ Xerxes passing by Adramyttium, and leaving the range of Mount Ida on his left hand, ἦσε ἐς τὴν Ἰλιάδα γῆν . . . Ἀπικομένου δὲ τοῦ στρατοῦ ἐπὶ τὸν Σκάμανδρον . . . ἐς τὸ Πριάμου Πέργαμον ἀνέβη, ἵμερον έχων θεήσασθαι. Θεησάμενος δὲ, καὶ πυθόμενος κείνων ἔκαστα, τῇ Ἀθηναὶ τῷ Ἰλιάδι θύσει βοῦς χιλίας· χοὰς δὲ οἱ μάγοι τοῖσιν ἥρωσιν ἔχεαντο . . . "Ἄμα ἡμέρη δὲ ἐπορέθετο, ἐν ἀριστερῇ μὲν ἀπέργων Ροΐτειον πόλιν καὶ Ὀφρύνειον καὶ Δάρδανον, ἥπερ δὴ Ἀβύδῳ δμουρός ἐστιν" ἐν δεξιῇ δὲ, Γέργυιθας Τευκρός (Herod. vii. 43).

Respecting Alexander (Arrian, i. 11), 'Ανελθόντα δὲ ἐς Ἰλιον, τῇ Ἀθηνᾶ θύσαι τῇ Ἰλιάδι, καὶ τὴν πανοπλίαν τὴν αὐτοῦ ἀναθεῖναι εἰς τὸν γαδὺν, καὶ καθελεῖν ἀντὶ ταύτης τῶν ἱερῶν τινα ὅπλων ἔτι ἐκ τοῦ Τρωϊκοῦ ἔργου σωζόμενα· καὶ ταῦτα λέγουσιν δτὶ οἱ ὑπασπισταὶ ἔφερον πρὸ αὐτοῦ ἐς τὰς μάχας. Θύσαι δὲ αὐτὸν ἐπὶ τὸν βωμὸν τοῦ Δίδος τοῦ Ἐρκείου λόγος κατέχει, μῆνιν Πριάμου παραιτούμενον τῷ Νεοπτολέμου γένει, δὴ ἐς αὐτὸν καθῆκε.

The inhabitants of Ilium also showed the lyre which had belonged to Paris (Plutarch, Alexand. c. 15).

Chandler, in his History of Ilium, ch. xxii. p. 89, seems to think that the place called by Herodotus the Pergamum of Priam is different from the historical Ilium. But the mention of the Iliean Athénê identifies them as the same.

² Strabo, xiii. p. 602. 'Ελλανικος δὲ χαριζόμενος τοῖς Ἰλιεῦσιν, οἶος δὲ κείνου μῆθος, συνηγορεῖ τῷ τὴν αὐτὴν εἰναι πόλιν τὴν γῦν τῇ τότε. Hellanikus had written a work called Τρωϊκά.

³ Xenoph. Hellen. i. 1, 10. Skylax places Ilium twenty-five stadia, or about three miles from the sea (c. 94). But I do not understand how he can call Skêpsis and Kebrêν πόλεις ἐπὶ θαλάσσῃ.

During the interval between the Peloponnesian war and the Macedonian invasion of Persia, Ilium was always garrisoned as a strong position: but its domain was still narrow, and did not extend even to the sea which was so near to it.¹ Alexander, on crossing the Hellespont, sent his army from Sestus to Abydus, under Parmenio, and sailed personally from Elæeus in the Chersonese, after having solemnly sacrificed at the Elæuntian shrine of Prôtesilaus, to the Harbour of the Achæans between Sigeium and Rhœteium. He then ascended to Ilium, sacrificed to the Iliean Athénê, and consecrated in her temple his own panoply, in exchange for which he took some of the sacred arms there suspended, which were said to have been preserved from the time of the Trojan war. These arms were carried before him when he went to battle by his armour-bearers. It is a fact still more curious, and illustrative of the strong working of the old legend on an impressible and eminently religious mind, that he also sacrificed to Priam himself on the very altar of Zeus Herkeius from which the old king was believed to have been torn by Neoptolemus. As that fierce warrior was his heroic ancestor by the maternal side, he desired to avert from himself the anger of Priam against the Achilleid race.²

Alexander made to the inhabitants of Ilium many munificent promises, which he probably would have executed, had he not been prevented by untimely death. One of his successors, Antigonus,³ founded the city of Alexandreia in the Trôad,

¹ See Xenoph. Hellen. iii. i. 16; and the description of the seizure of Ilium, along with Skêpsis and Kebrê, by the chief of mercenaries, Charidêmus, in Demosthen. cont. Aristocrat. c. 38, p. 671: compare Æneas, Poliorcetic. c. 24, and Polyæn. iii. 14.

² Arrian, *I. c.* Dikæarchus composed a separate work respecting this sacrifice of Alexander, *περὶ τῆς ἐν Ἰλαῖς θυσίας* (Athenæ. xiii. p. 603; Dikæarch. Fragm. p. 114, ed. Fuhr).

Theophrastus, in noticing old and venerable trees, mentions the *φηγὸν* (*Quercus asculus*) on the tomb of Ilus at Ilium, without any doubt of the authenticity of the place (De Plant. iv. 14); and his contemporary, the harper Stratoniros, intimates the same feeling, in his jest on the visit of a bad sophist to Ilium during the festival of the Ilieia (Athenæ. viii. p. 351). The same may be said respecting the author of the tenth epistle ascribed to the orator Æschinês (p. 737), in which his visit of curiosity to Ilium is described—as well as about Apollônias of Tyana, or the writer who describes his life and his visit to the Trôad; it is evident that he did not distrust the *ἀρχαιολογία* of the Ilieans, who affirmed their town to be the real Troy (Philostrat. Vit. Apollôn Tyan. iv. 11).

The goddess Athénê of Ilium was reported to have rendered valuable assistance to the inhabitants of Kyzikus, when they were besieged by Mithridatês, commemorated by inscriptions set up in Ilium (Plutarch, Lucull. 10).

³ Strabo, xiii. p. 603-607.

between Sigeum and the more southerly promontory of Lektum; compressing into it the inhabitants of many of the neighbouring Æolic towns in the region of Ida,—Skêpsis, Kebrêن, Hamaxitus, Kolônæ, and Neandria, though the inhabitants of Skêpsis were subsequently permitted by Lysimachus to resume their own city and autonomous government. Ilium however remained without any special mark of favour until the arrival of the Romans in Asia and their triumph over Antiochus (about 190 B.C.). Though it retained its walls and its defensible position, Démétrius of Skêpsis, who visited it shortly before that event, described it as being then in a state of neglect and poverty, many of the houses not even having tiled roofs.¹ In this dilapidated condition, however, it was still

¹ Livy xxxv. 43; xxxvii. 9. Polyb. v. 78-111 (passages which prove that Ilium was fortified and defensible about B.C. 218). Strabo, xiii. p. 594. *Kai τὸ Ίλιον δ', οὐ νῦν ἀστι, κωμόπολις τις ἦν, διε το πρῶτον Ρωμαῖοι τῆς Ἀστας ἐπέβησαν καὶ ἐξέβαλον Ἀντίοχον τὸν μέγαν ἐκ τῆς ἀντὸς τοῦ Ταύρου. Φησὶ γοῦν Δημήτριος δὲ Σκῆψιος, μειράκιον ἐπιδήμησαν εἰς τὴν πόλιν κατ' ἐκείνους τοὺς καιροὺς, οὕτως ὀλιγωρημένην ἰδεῖν τὴν κατοικίαν, ὥστε μηδὲ κεραμωτὰς ἔχειν τὰς στέγας. Ἡγησίαν δὲ, τὸν Γαλάτας περιασθέντας ἐκ τῆς Εὐρώπης, ἀναβῆναι μὲν εἰς τὴν πόλιν δεομένους ἐρύματος, παραχρῆμα δ' ἐκλιπεῖν διὰ τὸ ἀτελεῖστον ὑστερον δὲ ἐπανόρθωσιν ἔσχε πολλήν. Εἰτ' ἐκάστων αὐτὴν πάλιν οἱ μετὰ Φιμβρίου, &c.*

Here is a very clear and precise statement, attested by an eye-witness. But it is thoroughly inconsistent with the statement made by Strabo in the previous chapter, a dozen lines before, as the text now stands; for he there informs us that Lysimachus, after the death of Alexander, paid great attention to Ilium, surrounded it with a wall of forty stadia in circumference, erected a temple, and aggregated to Ilium the ancient cities around, which were in a state of decay. We know from Livy that the aggregation of Gergis and Rhoeteum to Ilium was effected, not by Lysimachus, but by the Romans (Livy, xxxviii. 37); so that the *first* statement of Strabo is not only inconsistent with his *second*, but is contradicted by an independent authority.

I cannot but think that this contradiction arises from a confusion of the text in Strabo's *first* passage, and that in that passage Strabo really meant to speak only of the improvements brought about by Lysimachus in *Alexandria Trôas*; that he never meant to ascribe to Lysimachus any improvements in *Ilium*, but, on the contrary, to assign the remarkable attention paid by Lysimachus to *Alexandria Trôas*, as the reason why he had neglected to fulfil the promises held out by Alexander to *Ilium*. The series of Strabo's allegations runs thus:—1. Ilium is nothing better than a *κώμη* at the landing of Alexander; 2. Alexander promises great additions, but never returns from Persia to accomplish them; 3. Lysimachus is absorbed in *Alexandria Trôas*, into which he aggregates several of the adjoining old towns, and which flourishes under his hands; 4. Hence Ilium remained a *κώμη* when the Romans entered Asia, as it had been when Alexander entered.

This alteration in the text of Strabo might be effected by the simple transposition of the words as they now stand, and by omitting *διε το*, *ἥδη* *ἐπεμελήθη*, without introducing a single new or conjectural word, so that

mythically recognised both by Antiochus and by the Roman consul Livius, who went up thither to sacrifice to the Iliean Athénê. The Romans, proud of their origin from Troy and Aeneas, treated Ilium with signal munificence ; not only granting to it immunity from tribute, but also adding to its domain the neighbouring territories of Gergis, Rheteium and Sigeium—and making the Ilieans masters of the whole coast¹ from the Peræa (or continental possessions) of Tenedos (southward of Sigeium) to the boundaries of Dardanus, which had its own title to legendary reverence as the special sovereignty of Aeneas. The inhabitants of Sigeium made such resistance to this loss of autonomy, that their city was destroyed by the Ilieans.

The dignity and power of Ilium being thus prodigiously enhanced, we cannot doubt that the inhabitants assumed to themselves exaggerated importance as the recognised parents of all-conquering Rome. Partly, we may naturally suppose, from the jealousies thus aroused on the part of their neighbours at Skëpsis and Alexandreia Trôas—partly from the pronounced tendency of the age (in which Kratês at Pergamus and Aristarchus at Alexandria divided between them the palm of literary celebrity) towards criticism and illustration of the old poets—a blow was now aimed at the mythical legitimacy of Ilium. Démêtrius of Skëpsis, one of the most laborious of the Homeric critics, had composed thirty books of comment upon the Catalogue in the Iliad: Hestiaea, an authoress of Alexandreia Trôas, had written on the same subject: both of them, well acquainted with the locality, remarked that the vast battles described in the Iliad could not be packed into the narrow space between Ilium and the Naustathmon of the Greeks; the more so, as that space, too small even as it then stood, had been considerably enlarged since the date of the *passage* would read thus:—Μετὰ δὲ τὴν ἑκένον (Alexander's) τελευτὴν Λυσίμαχος μάλιστα τῆς Ἀλεξανδρείας ἐπεμελήθη, συνφικισμένης μὲν ἦδη ὅπ' Ἀντιγόνου, καὶ προστηγορευμένης Ἀντιγόνιας, μεταβαλούσης δὲ τούνομα· (ἴδοκε γὰρ εὐσεβὲς εἶναι τοὺς Ἀλεξανδρὸν διαδεξαμένους ἑκείνους πρότερον κτίσειν ἀντονύμους πόλεις, εἰθ' ἑαυτῶν) καὶ νεών κατεσκενεῖσα καὶ τείχος περιεβάλλετο δύον 40 σταδίων² συνφικίσει δὲ εἰς αὐτὴν τὰς κύκλῳ πόλεις ἄρχαιας, ἦδη κεκακωμένας. Καὶ δὴ καὶ συνέμεινε . . . πόλεων. If this reading be adopted, the words beginning that which stands in Tzschucke's edition as sect. 27, and which immediately follow the last word πόλεων, will read quite suitably and coherently—Καὶ τὸ Ἰλιον δ', οὐ νῦν ἔστι, κωμόπολίς τις ἦν, οὐτε πρῶτον Ρωμαῖοι τῆς Ἀστελλῆς ἐπέβησαν, &c., whereas with the present reading of the passage they show a contradiction, and the whole passage is entirely confused.

¹ Livy, xxxviii. 39; Strabo, xiii. p. 600. Κατέσκαπται δὲ καὶ τὸ Σίγειον ὅπε τῶν Ἰλιέων διὰ τὴν ἀπειθείαν· ὅπ' ἑκένοις γὰρ ἦν ὕστερον ἡ παραλία πᾶσα ἢ μέχρι Δαρδάνου, καὶ νῦν ὅπ' ἑκένοις ἔστι.

Iliad by deposits at the mouth of the Skamander.¹ They found no difficulty in pointing out topographical incongruities and impossibilities as to the incidents in the Iliad, which they professed to remove by the startling theory that the Homeric Ilium had not occupied the site of the city so called. There was a village, called the village of the Ilieans, situated rather less than four miles from the city in the direction of Mount Ida, and farther removed from the sea; here, they affirmed, the "holy Troy" had stood.

No positive proof was produced to sustain the conclusion, for Strabo expressly states that not a vestige of the ancient city remained at the village of the Ilieans.² But the fundamental supposition was backed by a second accessory supposition, to explain how it happened that all such vestiges had disappeared. Nevertheless Strabo adopts the unsupported hypothesis of Démétrius as if it were an authenticated fact—distinguishing pointedly between Old and New Ilium, and even censuring Hellanikus for having maintained the received local faith. But I cannot find that Démétrius and Hestiae have been followed in this respect by any other writer of ancient times excepting Strabo. Ilium still continued to be talked of and treated by every one as the genuine Homeric Troy: the cruel jests of the Roman rebel Fimbria, when he sacked the town and massacred the inhabitants—the compensation made by Sylla, and the pronounced favour of Julius Cæsar and Augustus,—all prove this continued recognition of identity.³ Arrian, though a native of Nicomedia, holding a high appointment in Asia Minor, and

¹ Strabo, xiii. 599. Παρατίθοσι δὲ δ Δημήτριος καὶ τὴν Ἀλεξανδρίνην Ἐστίαιαν μάρτυρα, τὴν συγγράψασαν περὶ τῆς Ὄμηρου Ἰλιάδος, πυνθανομένην, εἰ περὶ τὴν νῦν πόλιν δ πόλεμος συνέστη, καὶ τὸ Τρωϊκὸν πεδίον ποῦ ἔστιν, δ μεταξὺ τῆς πόλεως καὶ τῆς θαλάσσης δ ποιητῆς φράζει· τὸ μὲν γὰρ πρὸ τῆς νῦν πόλεως δρώμενον, πρόχωμα εἶναι τῶν ποταμῶν, ὑστερον γεγονός.

The words *ποῦ ἔστιν* are introduced conjecturally by Grosskurd, the excellent German translator of Strabo, but they seem to me necessary to make the sense complete.

Hestiae is cited more than once in the Homeric Scholia (Schol. Venet. ad Iliad. iii. 64; Eustath. ad Iliad. ii. 538).

² Strabo, xiii. p. 599. Οὐδὲν δ' ἵχνος σώζεται τῆς ἀρχαίας πόλεως—εἰκότως· ἔτε γὰρ ἐκπεπορθημένων τῶν κύκλῳ πόλεων, οὐ τελέως δὲ κατεσπασμένων, οἱ λίθοι πάντες εἰς τὴν ἐκείνων ἀνάληψιν μετηνέχθησαν.

³ Appian, Mithridat. c. 53; Strabo, xiii. p. 594; Plutarch, Sertorius, c. 1; Velleius Paterc. ii. 23.

The inscriptions attest Panathenaic games celebrated at Ilium in honour of Athénè by the Ilieans conjointly with various other neighbouring cities (see Corp. Inscr. Boeckh. No. 3601-3602, with Boeckh's observations). The valuable inscription No. 3595 attests the liberality of Antiochus Soter towards the Iliean Athénè as early as 278 B.C.

remarkable for the exactness of his topographical notices, describes the visit of Alexander to Ilium, without any suspicion that the place with all its relics was a mere counterfeit : Aristidēs, Dio Chrysostom, Pausanias, Appian, and Plutarch hold the same language.¹ But modern writers seem for the most part to have taken up the supposition from Strabo as implicitly as he took it from Démétrius. They call Ilium by the disrespectful appellation of *New Ilium*—while the traveller in the Trôad looks for *Old Ilium* as if it were the unquestionable spot where Priam had lived and moved ; the name is even formally enrolled on the best maps recently prepared of the ancient Trôad.²

¹ Arrian, i. 11 ; Appian *ut sup.* ; also Aristidēs, Or. 43, Rhodiaca, p. 820 (Dindorf. p. 369). The curious *Oratio xi.* of Dio Chrysostom, in which he writes his new version of the Trojan war, is addressed to the inhabitants of Ilium.

² The controversy, now half a century old, respecting Troy and the Trojan war—between Bryant and his various opponents, Morritt, Gilbert Wakefield, the British Critic, &c., seems now nearly forgotten, and I cannot think that the pamphlets on either side would be considered as displaying much ability if published at the present day. The discussion was first raised by the publication of Le Chevalier's account of the plain of Troy, in which the author professed to have discovered the true site of Old Ilium (the supposed Homeric Troy), about twelve miles from the sea near Bounarbashi. Upon this account Bryant published some animadversions followed up by a second Treatise, in which he denied the historical reality of the Trojan war, and advanced the hypothesis that the tale was of Egyptian origin (Dissertation on the War of Troy, and the expedition of the Grecians as described by Homer, showing that no such expedition was ever undertaken, and that no such city of Phrygia existed, by Jacob Bryant ; seemingly 1797, though there is no date in the title-page : Morritt's reply was published in 1798). A reply from Mr. Bryant and a rejoinder from Mr. Morritt, as well as a pamphlet from G. Wakefield, appeared in 1799 and 1800, besides an Expostulation by the former addressed to the British Critic.

Bryant, having dwelt both on the incredibilities and the inconsistencies of the Trojan war, as it is recounted in Grecian legend generally, nevertheless admitted that Homer had a groundwork for his story, and maintained that that groundwork was Egyptian. Homer (he thinks) was an Ithacan, descended from a family originally emigrant from Egypt : the war of Troy was originally an Egyptian war, which explains how Memnôn the Ethiopian came to take part in it : “upon this history, which was originally Egyptian, Homer founded the scheme of his two principal poems, adapting things to Greece and Phrygia by an ingenious transposition :” he derived information from priests of Memphis or Thêbes (Bryant, pp. 102, 108, 126). The *“Hρως Αἴγυπτος*, mentioned in the second book of the *Odyssey* (15), is the Egyptian hero, who affords (in his view), an evidence that the population of that island was in part derived from Egypt. No one since Mr. Bryant, I apprehend, has ever construed the passage in the same sense.

Bryant's Egyptian hypothesis is of no value ; but the negative portion of his argument, summing up the particulars of the Trojan legend, and

Strabo has here converted into geographical matter of fact an hypothesis purely gratuitous, with a view of saving the accuracy of the Homeric topography ; though in all probability the locality of the pretended old Ilium would have been found open to difficulties not less serious than those which it was introduced to obviate.¹ It may be true that Démétrius and he

contending against its historical credibility, is not so easily put aside. Few persons will share in the zealous conviction by which Morritt tries to make it appear that the 1100 ships, the ten years of war, the large confederacy of princes from all parts of Greece, &c., have nothing but what is consonant with historical probability ; difficulties being occasionally eliminated by the plea of our ignorance of the time and of the subject (Morritt, p. 7-21). Gilbert Wakefield, who maintains the historical reality of the siege with the utmost intensity, and even compares Bryant to Tom Payne (W. p. 17), is still more displeased with those who propound doubts, and tells us that “grave disputation in the midst of such darkness and uncertainty is a conflict with chimæras” (W. p. 14.)

The most plausible line of argument taken by Morritt and Wakefield is, where they enforce the positions taken by Strabo and so many other authors, ancient as well as modern, that a superstructure of fiction is to be distinguished from a basis of truth, and that the latter is to be maintained while the former is rejected (Morritt, p. 5 ; Wake. p. 7-8). To this Bryant replies, that “if we leave out every absurdity, we can make anything plausible : that a fable may be made consistent, and we have many romances that are very regular in the assortment of characters and circumstances : this may be seen in plays, memoirs, and novels. But this regularity and correspondence alone will not ascertain the truth.” (Expostulation, pp. 8, 12, 13.) “That there are a great many other fables besides that of Troy, regular and consistent among themselves, believed and chronologised by the Greeks, and even looked up to by them in a religious view (p. 13), which yet no one now thinks of admitting as history.”

Morritt, having urged the universal belief of antiquity as evidence that the Trojan war was historically real, is met by Bryant, who reminds him that the same persons believed in centaurs, satyrs, nymphs, augury, aruspicy ; Homer maintaining that horses could speak, &c. To which Morritt replies, “What has religious belief to do with historical facts ? Is not the evidence on which our faith rests in matters of religion totally different in all its parts from that on which we ground our belief in history ?” (Addit. Remarks, p. 47.)

The separation between the grounds of religious and historical belief is by no means so complete as Mr. Morritt supposes, even in regard to modern times ; and when we apply his position to the ancient Greeks, it will be found completely the reverse of the truth. The contemporaries of Herodotus and Thucydidēs conceived their early history in the most intimate conjunction with their religion.

¹ For example, adopting his own line of argument (not to mention those battles in which the pursuit and the flight reaches from the city to the ships and back again), it might have been urged to him, that by supposing the Homeric Troy to be four miles farther off from the sea, he aggravated the difficulty of rolling the Trojan horse into the town ; it was already sufficiently hard to propel this vast wooden animal full of heroes from the Greek Naustathmon to the town of Ilium.

The Trojan horse, with its accompaniments Sinon and Laokoōn, is one of

were justified in their negative argument, so as to show that the battles described in the Iliad could not possibly have taken place if the city of Priam had stood on the hill inhabited by the Ilieans. But the legendary faith subsisted before, and continued without abatement afterwards, notwithstanding such topographical impossibilities. Hellanikus, Herodotus, Minderus, the guides of Xerxēs, and Alexander, had not been shocked by them: the case of the latter is the strongest of all, because he had received the best education of his time under Aristotle—he was a passionate admirer and constant reader of the Iliad—he was moreover personally familiar with the movements of armies, and lived at a time when maps, which began with Anaximander, the disciple of Thalēs, were at least known to all who sought instruction. Now if, notwithstanding such advantages, Alexander fully believed in the identity of Ilium, unconscious of these many and glaring topographical difficulties, much less would Homer himself, or the Homeric auditors, be likely to pay attention to them, at a period, five centuries earlier, of comparative rudeness and ignorance, when prose records as well as geographical maps were totally unknown.¹

the capital and indispensable events in the epic: Homer, Arktinus, Leschēs, Virgil, and Quintus Smyrnæus, all dwell upon it emphatically as the proximate cause of the capture.

The difficulties and inconsistencies of the movements ascribed to Greeks and Trojans in the Iliad, when applied to real topography, are well set forth in Spohn, *De Agro Trojano*, Leipsic, 1814; and Mr. Maclarens has shown (Dissertation on the Topography of the Trojan War, Edinburgh, 1822) that these difficulties are nowise obviated by removing Ilium a few miles farther from the sea.

¹ Major Rennell argues differently from the visit of Alexander, employing it to confute the hypothesis of Chevalier, who had placed the Homeric Troy at Bounarbashi, the site supposed to have been indicated by Démétrius and Strabo—

“ Alexander is said to have been a passionate admirer of the Iliad, and he had an opportunity of deciding on the spot how far the topography was consistent with the narrative. Had he been shown the site of Bounarbashi for that of Troy, he would probably have questioned the fidelity either of the historical part of the poem or his guides. It is not within credibility, that a person of so correct a judgement as Alexander could have admired a poem, which contained a long history of military details, and other transactions that could not physically have had an existence. What pleasure could he receive, in contemplating as subjects of history, events which could not have happened? Yet he did admire the poem, and *therefore must have found the topography consistent*: that is, Bounarbashi, surely, was not shown to him for Troy.” (Rennell, Observations on the Plain of Troy, p. 128.)

Major Rennell here supposes in Alexander a spirit of topographical criticism quite foreign to his real character. We have no reason to believe that the site of Bounarbashi was shown to Alexander as the Homerid Troy, or that *any* site was shown to him *except Ilium*, or what Strabo calls New

specially noting the diversity of language;¹ and in the Iliad the Phrygians are simply numbered among the allies of Troy from the far Ascania, without indication of any more intimate relationship.² Nor do the tales which connect Dardanus with Samothrace and Arcadia find countenance in the Homeric poems, wherein Dardanus is the son of Zeus, having no root anywhere except in Dardania.³ The mysterious solemnities of Samothrace, afterwards so highly venerated throughout the Grecian world, date from a period much later than Homer; and the religious affinities of that island as well as of Krête with the territories of Phrygia and Æolis, were certain, according to the established tendency of the Grecian mind, to beget stories of a common genealogy.

To pass from this legendary world,—an aggregate of streams distinct and heterogeneous, which do not willingly come into confluence, and cannot be forced to intermix,—into the clearer vision afforded by Herodotus, we learn from him that in the year 500 B.C. the whole coast-region from Dardanus southward to the promontory of Lektum (including the town of Ilium), and from Lektum eastward to Adramyttium, had been Æolised, or was occupied by Æolic Greeks—likewise the inland towns of Sképsis⁴ and Kebrén. So that if we draw a line northward from Adramyttium to Kyzikus on the Propontis—throughout the whole territory westward from that line, to the Hellespont and the Ægean Sea, all the considerable towns would be Hellenic. With the exception of Gêrgis and the Teukrian population around it, all the towns worthy of note were either Ionic or Æolic. A century earlier, the Teukrian population would have embraced a wider range—perhaps Sképsis and Kebrén, the latter of which places was colonised by Greeks from Kyme:⁵ a century afterwards, during the satrapy

¹ Homer, Hymn. in Vener. 116.

² Iliad, ii. 863. Asius, the brother of Hekabê, lives in Phrygia on the banks of the Sangarius (Iliad, xvi. 717).

³ See Hellanik. Fragm. 129, 130, ed. Didot; and Kephalôn Gergithius ap. Steph. Byz. v. *Αρισθή*.

⁴ Sképsis received some colonists from the Ionic Milêtus (Anaximénês apud Strabo, xiv. p. 635); but the coins of the place prove that its dialect was Æolic. See Klausen, *Æneas und die Penaten*, t. i. note 180.

Arisbê also, near Abydus, seems to have been settled from Mitylêne (Eustath. ad Iliad, xii. 97).

The extraordinary fertility and rich black mould of the plain around Ilium is noticed by modern travellers (see Franklin, *Remarks and Observations on the Plain of Troy*, London, 1800, p. 44): it is also easily worked: “a couple of buffaloes or oxen were sufficient to draw the plough, whereas near Constantinople it takes twelve or fourteen.”

⁵ Ephôrus ap. Harpocrat. v. *Κεφρῆνα*.

extensive region called *Trōas*, or the *Trōad* (more properly *Trōias*), is known both to Herodotus and to Thucydidēs: it seems to include the territory westward of an imaginary line drawn from the north-east corner of the Adramyttian gulf to the Propontis at Parium, since both Antandrus, Kolōnæ, and the district immediately round Ilium, are regarded as belonging to the *Trōad*.¹ Herodotus further notices the Teukrians of Gergis² (a township conterminous with Ilium, and lying to the eastward of the road from Ilium to Abydus), considering them as the remnant of a larger Teukrian population which once resided in the country, and which had in very early times undertaken a vast migration from Asia into Europe.³ To that Teukrian population he thinks that the Homeric Trojans belonged:⁴ and by later writers, especially by Virgil and the other Romans, the names Teukrians and Trojans are employed as equivalents. As the name *Trojans* is not mentioned in any contemporary historical monument, so the name *Teukrians* never once occurs in the old Epic. It appears to have been first noticed by the elegiac poet Kallinus, about 660 B.C., who connected it with an alleged immigration of Teukrians from Krête into the region round about Ida. Others again denied this, asserting that the primitive ancestor, Teukros, had come into the country from Attica,⁵ and that he was of indigenous origin, born from Skamander and the nymph Idæa—all various manifestations of that eager thirst after an eponymous hero which never deserted the Greeks. Gergithians occur in more than one spot in *Æolis*, even so far southward as the neighbourhood of Kymê:⁶ the name has no place in Homer, but he mentions Gorgythion and Kebriones as illegitimate sons of Priam, thus giving a sort of epical recognition both to Gergis and Kebrēn. As Herodotus calls the old epical Trojans by the name Teukrians, so the Attic tragedians call them Phrygians; though the Homeric Hymn to Aphroditē represents Phrygians and Trojans as completely distinct,

¹ Compare Herodot. v. 24-122; Thucyd. i. 131. The 'Ιλιὰς γῆ is a part of the *Trōad*.

² Herodot. vii. 43.

³ Herodot. v. 122. εἶλε μὲν Αἰολέας πάντας, δύοι τὴν Ἰλιάδα γῆν νέμονται, εἶλε δὲ Γέργυθας τοὺς ἀπολειφθέντας τῶν ἀρχαίων Τεύκρων.

For the migration of the Teukrians and Mysians into Europe, see Herodot. vii. 20; the Pæonians, on the Strymōn, called themselves their descendants.

⁴ Herodot. ii. 118; v. 13.

⁵ Strabo, xiii. p. 604; Apollodōr. iii. 12, 4.

Kephalōn of Gergis called Teukros a Krêtan (Stephan. Byz. v. 'Αρίσθη).

⁶ Clearchus ap. Athenæ. vi. p. 256; Strabo, xiii. p. 589-616.

specially noting the diversity of language;¹ and in the Iliad the Phrygians are simply numbered among the allies of Troy from the far Ascania, without indication of any more intimate relationship.² Nor do the tales which connect Dardanus with Samothrace and Arcadia find countenance in the Homeric poems, wherein Dardanus is the son of Zeus, having no root anywhere except in Dardania.³ The mysterious solemnities of Samothrace, afterwards so highly venerated throughout the Grecian world, date from a period much later than Homer; and the religious affinities of that island as well as of Krête with the territories of Phrygia and Aeolis, were certain, according to the established tendency of the Grecian mind, to beget stories of a common genealogy.

To pass from this legendary world,—an aggregate of streams distinct and heterogeneous, which do not willingly come into confluence, and cannot be forced to intermix,—into the clearer vision afforded by Herodotus, we learn from him that in the year 500 B.C. the whole coast-region from Dardanus southward to the promontory of Lektum (including the town of Ilium), and from Lektum eastward to Adramyttium, had been Aeolised, or was occupied by Aeolic Greeks—likewise the inland towns of Sképsis⁴ and Kebrén. So that if we draw a line northward from Adramyttium to Kyzikus on the Propontis—throughout the whole territory westward from that line, to the Hellespont and the Aegean Sea, all the considerable towns would be Hellenic. With the exception of Gêrgis and the Teukrian population around it, all the towns worthy of note were either Ionic or Aeolic. A century earlier, the Teukrian population would have embraced a wider range—perhaps Sképsis and Kebrén, the latter of which places was colonised by Greeks from Kyme:⁵ a century afterwards, during the satrapy

¹ Homer, Hymn. in Vener. 116.

² Iliad, ii. 863. Asius, the brother of Hekabê, lives in Phrygia on the banks of the Sangarius (Iliad, xvi. 717).

³ See Hellanik. Fragm. 129, 130, ed. Didot; and Kephalôn Gergithius ap. Steph. Byz. v. *Αρισθή*.

⁴ Sképsis received some colonists from the Ionic Milêtus (Anaximénês apud Strabo, xiv. p. 635); but the coins of the place prove that its dialect was Aeolic. See Klausen, *Aeneas und die Penaten*, t. i. note 180.

Arisbê also, near Abydus, seems to have been settled from Mitylêne (Eustath. ad Iliad, xii. 97).

The extraordinary fertility and rich black mould of the plain around Ilium is noticed by modern travellers (see Franklin, *Remarks and Observations on the Plain of Troy*, London, 1800, p. 44): it is also easily worked: “a couple of buffaloes or oxen were sufficient to draw the plough, whereas near Constantinople it takes twelve or fourteen.”

⁵ Ephôrus ap. Harpocrat. v. *Κεφρῆνα*.

of Pharnabazus, it appears that Gergis had become Hellenised as well as the rest. The four towns, Ilium, Gergis, Kebrén and Skêpsis, all in lofty and strong positions, were distinguished each by a solemn worship and temple of Athénê, and by the recognition of that goddess as their special patroness.¹

The author of the Iliad conceived the whole of this region as occupied by people not Greek,—Trojans, Dardanians, Lykians, Lelegians, Pelasgians, and Kilikians. He recognises a temple and worship of Athénê in Ilium, though the goddess is bitterly hostile to the Trojans: and Arktinus described the Palladium as the capital protection of the city. But perhaps the most remarkable feature of identity between the Homeric and the historical *Æolis*, is the solemn and diffused worship of the Sminthian Apollo. Chrysê, Killa and Tenedos, and more than one place called Sminthium, maintain the surname and invoke the protection of that god during later times, just as they are emphatically described to do by Homer.²

When it is said that the Post-Homeric Greeks gradually Hellenised this entire region, we are not to understand that the whole previous population either retired or was destroyed. The Greeks settled in the leading and considerable towns, which enabled them both to protect one another and to gratify their predominant tastes. Partly by force—but greatly also by that superior activity, and power of assimilating foreign ways of thought to their own, which distinguished them from the beginning—they invested all the public features and management of

¹ Xenop. Hellen. i. 1, 10; iii. 1, 10-15.

One of the great motives of Dio in setting aside the Homeric narrative of the Trojan war, is to vindicate Athénê from the charge of having unjustly destroyed her own city of Ilium (Orat. xi. p. 310: *μάλιστα διὰ τὴν Ἀθηνᾶν ὅπως μὴ δοκῆ ἀδίκως διαφθείρει τὴν ἑαυτῆς πόλιν*).

² Strabo, x. p. 473; xiii. p. 604-605. Polemon. Fragm. 31, p. 63, ed. Preller.

Polemon was a native of Ilium, and had written a *periegesis* of the place (about 200 B.C., therefore earlier than Démétrius of Skêpsis): he may have witnessed the improvement in its condition effected by the Romans. He noticed the identical stone upon which Palamèdès had taught the Greeks to play at dice.

The Sminthian Apollo appears inscribed on the coins of Alexandria Trôas; and the temple of the god was memorable even down to the time of the emperor Julian (Ainmian. Marcellin. xxii. 8). Compare Menander (the Rhetor) *περὶ Ἐπιδεικτικῶν*, iv. 14; apud Walz. Collect. Rhetor. t. ix. p. 304; also *περὶ Σμινθιακῶν*, iv. 17.

Σμύνθος, both in the Krêtan and the *Æolic* dialect, meant a *field-mouse*: the region seems to have been greatly plagued by these little animals.

Polemon could not have accepted the theory of Démétrius, that Ilium was not the genuine Troy: his *Periegesis*, describing the localities and relics of Ilium, implied the legitimacy of the place as a matter of course.

the town with an Hellenic air, distributed all about it their gods, their heroes and their legends, and rendered their language the medium of public administration, religious songs and addresses to the gods, and generally for communications wherein any number of persons were concerned. But two remarks are here to be made : first, in doing this they could not avoid taking to themselves more or less of that which belonged to the parties with whom they fraternised, so that the result was not pure Hellenism ; next, that even this was done only in the towns, without being fully extended to the territorial domain around, or to those smaller townships which stood to the town in a dependent relation. The Æolic and Ionic Greeks borrowed, from the Asiatics whom they had Hellenised, musical instruments and new laws of rhythm and melody, which they knew how to turn to account : they further adopted more or less of those violent and maddening religious rites, manifested occasionally in self-inflicted suffering and mutilation, which were indigenous in Asia Minor in the worship of the Great Mother. The religion of the Greeks in the region of Ida as well as at Kyzikus was more orgiastic than the native worship of Greece Proper, just as that of Lampsacus, Priapus, and Parium was more licentious. From the Teukrian region of Gergis, and from the Gergithes near Kymê, sprang the original Sibylline prophecies, and the legendary Sibyll who plays so important a part in the tale of Æneas. The mythe of the Sibyll, whose prophecies are supposed to be heard in the hollow blast bursting out from obscure caverns and apertures in the rocks,¹ was indigenous among the Gergithian Teukrians, and passed from the Kymæans in Æolis, along with the other circumstances of the tale of Æneas, to their brethren the inhabitants of Cumæ in Italy. The date of the Gergithian Sibyll, or rather of the circulation of her supposed prophecies, is placed during the reign of Croesus, a period when Gergis was thoroughly Teukrian. Her prophecies, though embodied in Greek verses, had their root in a Teukrian soil and feelings ; and the promises of future empire which they so liberally make to the fugitive hero escaping from the flames of Troy into Italy, become interesting from the remarkable way in which they were realised by Rome.²

¹ Virgil, *Æneid*, vi. 42—

Excisum Euboicæ latus ingens rupis in antrum,
Quo lati ducunt aditus centum, ostia centum :
Unde ruunt totidem voces, responsa Sibyllæ.

² Pausanias, x. 12, 8 ; Lactantius, i. 6, 12 ; Steph. Byz. v. Μέρμησσος ; Schol. Plat. Phædr. p. 315, Bekker.

At what time Ilium and Dardanus became Aeolised we have no information. We find the Mitylenæans in possession of Sigeium in the time of the poet Alkæus, about 600 B.C. ; and the Athenians, during the reign of Peisistratus, having wrested it from them and trying to maintain their possession, vindicate the proceeding by saying that they had as much right to it as the Mitylenæans, "for the latter had no more claim to it than any of the other Greeks who had aided Menelaus in avenging the abduction of Helen."¹ This is a very remarkable incident, as attesting the celebrity of the legend of Troy, and the value of a mythical title in international disputes—yet seemingly implying that the establishment of the Mitylenæans on that spot must have been sufficiently recent. The country near the junction of the Hellespont and the Propontis is represented as originally held² by Bebrykian Thracians, while Abydus was first occupied by Milesian colonists in the reign and by the permission of the Lydian king Gyges³—to whom the whole Trôad and the neighbouring territory belonged, and upon whom therefore the Teukrians of Ida must have been dependent. This must have been about 700 B.C., a period considerably earlier than the Mitylenæan occupation of Sigeium. Lampsacus and Pæsus, on the neighbouring shores of the Propontis, were also Milesian colonies, though we do not know their date: Parium was jointly settled from Milêtus, Erythræ and Parus.

The date of this Gergithian Sibyll, or of the prophecies passing under her name, is stated by Hérakleidès of Pontus, and there seems no reason for calling it in question.

Klausen (Æneas und die Penaten, book ii. p. 205) has worked out copiously the circulation and legendary import of the Sibylline prophecies.

¹ Herodot. v. 94. Σίγειον . . . τὸ εἴλε Πεισίστρατος αἰχμῆ παρὰ Μιτυληνῶν . . . Ἀθηναῖοι, ἀποδείκνυντες λόγῳ οὐδὲν μᾶλλον Αἰολεῦσι μετεύνη τῆς Ἰλιαδος χώρης, ή οὐ καὶ σφὶ καὶ τοῖσι ἄλλοισι, θοι Ἑλλήνων συνεξεπρήξαντο Μενέλεω τὰς Ἐλένης ἄρπαγας. In Æschylus (Eumenid. 402) the goddess Athénê claims the land about the Skamander, as having been presented to the sons of Thêseus by the general vote of the Grecian chiefs—

‘Απὸ Σκαμανδρού γῆς καταφθατουμένη,
*Ην δῆτ’ Ἀχαιῶν ἀκτορές τε καὶ πρόμοι
Τῶν αἰχμαλωτῶν χρημάτων λάχος μέγα,
*Ἐνειμαν αὐτότρεμον εἰς τὸ πάν έμοι,
*Ἐξαίρετον δώρημα Θησέως τόκοις.

In the days of Peisistratus, it seems, Athens was not bold enough or powerful enough to advance this vast pretension.

² Charôn of Lampsacus ap. Schol. Apollôn. Rhod. ii. 2; Bernhardy ad Dionys. Periégêt. 805, p. 747.

³ Such at least is the statement of Strabo (xii. p. 590); though such an extent of Lydian rule at that time seems not easy to reconcile with the proceedings of the subsequent Lydian kings.

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN BY
RICHARD CLAY & SONS, LIMITED,
BRUNSWICK ST., STAMFORD ST., S.E. 1,
AND BUNGAY, SUFFOLK.

